THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 153 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · AUGUST 9, 1941 NUMBER 6

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 101

EDITORIALS

"In Rising Wrath" *by Freda Kirchwey* 104
Call Japan's Bluff 105
Control Prices Now 106

ARTICLES

London—First Look *by Louis Fischer* 108
Oil on the Pacific *by I. F. Stone* 109
Britain's Danger Grows *by Donald W. Mitchell* 110
My Friend Marx Dormoy *by Pierre Cot* 113
Conscience Under the Draft *by Roger N. Baldwin* 114
Hitler and the Decalogue *by Rustem Vambery* 116
In the Wind 117
A Native at Large *by Jonathan Daniels* 118

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

Public Poem *by George Barker* 119
Primer for Appeasers *by Keith Hutchison* 120
America South *by Ralph Bates* 120
Building as Action *by Douglas Haskell* 121
Prospero Among Poets *by Babette Deutsch* 122
Trade-Union Statesmanship *by Rose M. Stein* 123
Technology and Sea Power *by Henry Guerlac* 124
In Brief 126
Records *by B. H. Haggin* 126

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS 128

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Washington Editor I. F. STONE
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Published weekly and copyright, 1941, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 18, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 856 National Press Building.

The Shape of Things

AMERICAN DIPLOMACY HAS MOVED IN THREE directions during the past week. It has applied more—but not much more—economic pressure to Japan in the hope of discouraging further obviously planned aggression. It has thrown its full weight into the effort to prevent Vichy from yielding to Hitler in Africa as it yielded to Hitler-plus-Tokyo in the Far East. And it has pledged all "practicable" economic aid to Russia in its resistance to Hitler. We have far more confidence in the permanent value of the last move than of either of the others. The State Department's handling of Japan has been, and still is, fatally weak, as events are proving. The combination of bribes and warnings applied to Vichy may for the moment strengthen the elements which oppose full and complete collaboration with Hitler in Africa. That it will fail in the long run we are certain. Vichy will yield to Hitler when it must, as it yielded in Indo-China. The weight of American diplomatic pressure is imponderably light compared with the weight of the German army on the soil of France. But help to Russia is an investment in strength, not weakness. The Russian army has not only revealed amazing power and determination but has survived without any material outside support. The promise of American help will stimulate democratic resistance in every part of the world more effectively than any measure taken since the lend-lease bill was passed.

*

THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SOVIET Union and the Polish government-in-exile ending the war between the two countries and providing for the establishment of a Polish army on Soviet soil is an event of considerable political importance. It eliminates one of the most serious obstacles to effective cooperation between the British and Soviet governments. It destroys an important prop in Hitler's anti-Russian crusade. Above all, it minimizes, if it does not altogether remove, one of the gravest problems to be faced in making the peace after Hitler's defeat. The pact itself is, as the New York *Times* describes it, "a miracle of conciliation." Both sides make far-reaching concessions. The Soviet Union withdraws its claims to the boundaries established after the partition of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1939, while Poland agrees not to insist on the pre-1939 frontier. This leaves the way open for new boundaries based more clearly upon ethnic and strategic realities than those established either by the Treaty of Riga or the defunct Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939. Some Polish leaders are reported to be holding out against the new agreement, but it is to be hoped that their differences will be resolved.

✶

THE "GREAT NEUTRAL," AS THE LONDON *Times* once called General Franco, has succeeded in disappointing the last of the British appeasers. From the Conservative benches of the House of Commons a roar of approval rose when Mr. Eden, still too softly, warned the Spanish dictator the other day that all kinds of economic help from Great Britain would cease unless his foreign policy showed less dependence upon the Axis. Now that the Foreign Office is finally considering Franco if not as an enemy at least as a candidate for the blacklist, it is to be hoped that our State Department and Ambassador Weddell will give up trying to use Spain as a card in the hand of the democracies. Franco's scandalous note to the Latin American countries inviting their support for Adolf Hitler's "holy war" against Russia is new evidence of the degree to which the Spanish dictator and his Phalanx have become the real agent of Nazi propaganda in that part of the Western Hemisphere. Madrid and Berlin today work hand in hand in Latin America to sabotage Washington's attempts to reinforce intercontinental solidarity. Only eight hours after this note was delivered, a note from the Wilhelmstrasse was circulated in the same countries blaming the United States for the Belmonte case in Bolivia. According to Berlin, the whole Bolivian Nazi plot was an invention forged in Washington with the purpose of "taking advantage of the poisoned atmosphere created by this kind of incident to obtain concessions of military and naval bases in South America." Exactly the same words were used by the Phalangist press in Madrid in commenting upon the abortive attempt in La Paz. One can hardly see what advantages are still expected in Washington from maintaining a diplomatic situation whose only appreciable result is to provide Hitler with a group of consuls and agents who represent themselves as members of the foreign service of Spain but in reality do the job of the German and Italian consuls expelled from this country.

✶

NAZI ACTIVITIES IN THIS HEMISPHERE HAVE been set back by fresh disclosures in a number of Latin American countries. The crushing of the Nazi putsch in Bolivia and the expulsion of the German minister to that country for improper activities were followed by Argentina's seizure of German diplomatic pouches containing an illegal short-wave radio-sending set and various documents in code. A few days later five persons were arrested in Paraná, charged with plotting against the Argentine government, and in Rosario, Argentina's second largest city, the headquarters of the German Welfare and Cultural Association were raided and found to contain considerable stocks of propaganda material. In Cuba four Nazis have been arrested on the charge of fifth-column activities, and President Batista has sought to check the activities of the Spanish Phalangists on the ground that they are Hitler-inspired. An Axis newspaper has been suppressed in Brazil for propaganda against the United States, and the German-owned Transocean News Agency has been shown in federal court to be the spearhead of Nazi propaganda in Uruguay, Peru, and several other South American countries. There are indications that these revelations have finally awakened Latin America to the danger of Nazi methods of penetration. Experienced observers who have recently returned from countries south of the Rio Grande speak glowingly of the progress which has been made toward hemispheric solidarity during the past year. They agree, however, that the battle is far from won. Distrust of "Yankee imperialism" lingers and is easily fanned into flame by a statement like that recently made by Senator Clark of Idaho, suggesting that we follow Hitler's example and seize the whole of Latin America. Fortunately, President Roosevelt lost no time in putting Senator Clark in his place.

✶

DELEGATES TO THE SIXTH CONVENTION OF the United Automobile Workers at Buffalo are riding in Ford cars put at their disposal by the company. This merry fact symbolizes the union's greatest victory of the year, or of any year—a signed contract with the Ford Motor Company which increased the U. A. W.'s membership by 120,000. That membership now stands at more than 500,000, representing an increase of 93 per cent over last year. The main issue before the convention is the proposed cut of 50 per cent in automobile production. As President R. J. Thomas pointed out in a radio address, it is cold comfort to be told by Leon Henderson that if the C. I. O.'s plan for mass production of airplanes had been followed, the automobile industry would not now be in a quandary and 200,000 workers would not be facing unemployment at a time when all available man-power should be utilized for defense. Mr. Thomas proposed a joint conference of automobile management, labor, and government experts to devise a program that would prevent dislocation. We hope the U. A. W. presses this demand with all its strength.

✶

ANOTHER ISSUE BEFORE THE CONVENTION is that of Communist domination in certain sectors of the union. There is a strong administration move under way to bar Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from any official position on the plausible ground that no one whose first

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loyalty is to a foreign government can be trusted to hold office in the union or serve its best interests. It is reassuring to note that the recent flop in the Communist Party line has not made the leaders of the U. A. W. any more trustful of its faithful followers. The issue will no doubt be squarely faced when the convention discusses the Inglewood walkout, which was denounced by the union executive as an outlaw strike instigated by the Communists, and which resulted in the use of troops to reopen the factory. One of the primary motivations in the Inglewood strike, according to an authoritative report at the time, was the hope of the Communist group that this show of "militance" would consolidate their strength in the fast growing aircraft locals of the U. A. W. and give them a chance to regain a controlling vote at the present convention. The showdown should be interesting.

✶

THE BLACKOUT OF GASOLINE FILLING PUMPS between 7 p. m. and 7 a. m. has been successful so far as compliance is concerned, but most reports agree that while some saving may result from the experiment, it is certain to fall far short of the one-third which Secretary Ickes declares to be necessary if rationing is to be avoided. The experiment illustrates the difficulties inherent in voluntary curtailment of consumer buying in the interest of national defense. Although an overwhelming majority of the American people are prepared to make sacrifices for defense if necessary, they are disinclined to make them unless they are sure that everyone else is doing the same thing under patriotic compulsion. Voluntary curtailment of the use of gasoline, such as Secretary Ickes called for, places a premium on unpatriotic action because it is virtually impossible to organize social sanctions against those who fail to comply. Rationing also has its drawbacks. It will be difficult to set up a system which makes full allowance for the necessary uses of private motor cars and yet prevents mere pleasure driving. But the hardships of rationing are certainly to be preferred to any curtailment in the shipment of oil to Britain.

✶

TO PASS A BILL PERMITTING THE SOLUTION of labor problems by bayonet would be to encourage every recalcitrant and greedy employer to refuse wage demands and call for troops instead. We are glad the House, by a vote of 255 to 114, has again rejected the Connally bill, even in its revised form. The bill, as Philip Murray said, was "not intended to exercise any compulsion against management, but only against labor," and it is not to be confused with the property-requisition bill which is still before Congress. Both Under Secretary of War Patterson and Edward F. Grady, Labor Adviser to the War Department, asked for passage of the revised Connally measure; they should know better next time. We are sorry to see that House Democratic Leader John W. McCormack voted for the bill, thus indicating that it had Administration support. Of seventy-eight Congressmen from the poll-tax states, sixty voted for the bill and twelve abstained. Progressives and Republicans generally joined against the bill, and Congressman Martin Dies, fresh from defeat in Texas, observed, "Now that the Republicans have gone over to the C. I. O., maybe I'd better start investigating them." The line-up again indicates that the Administration is keeping strange company in Congress. Congressman Healey of Massachusetts deserves mention for the outstanding part he played in the fight against the bill.

✶

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW FM RADIO is more likely to be stunted than furthered by permitting newspapers to control it. Testimony before the Federal Communications Commission last week that FM broadcasting would be delayed "for years" if the commission refused licenses to newspaper interests is economic nonsense. A field so lucrative as that of a new means of radio transmission can attract all the capital it needs. A good deal more enterprise will probably be shown in developing it if FM is kept free from the influence of newspapers which fear its competition. Leaving it to the newspapers to develop FM is like leaving it to the Aluminum Company to develop the competing metal, magnesium. With the growing press-radio monopoly at stake, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association is digging in for a long fight when the hearings resume in November. Elisha Hanson, counsel of the A. N. P. A., admitted that he has been advising newspapermen subpoenaed by the FCC to ignore the subpoenas on the ground that the investigation was illegal. This puts the A. N. P. A. in the position not merely of upholding the legality of press-radio monopolies but of denying the right of a government agency to hold an investigation to determine whether such combinations are in the public interest.

✶

COAL MINING IS STILL A SICK INDUSTRY, and contrary to the trend in the rest of business the first six coal companies to report second-quarter earnings show an annual increase in net loss rather than an increase in profits. This is the best excuse John L. Lewis can offer for his shortsighted opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. In the greatest single power and navigation project on this continent, which would enormously increase our capacity to defend ourselves in war and lower the cost of production in peace, Lewis sees only a means whereby "any tramp steamer will be able to come through this projected waterway and dump this coal at any price at Cleveland, Buffalo, and Chicago." The opposition of Lewis, which springs from his instinctive urge to cooperate with big business in the maintenance of favorable price and competitive conditions, is a serious matter. It adds to the collection of special interests opposed to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the seaway, and it makes its fate in Congress more precarious than ever. There was a time when British workers smashed machinery and a time more recently when German workers thought their safety lay in partnership with industrial cartels. Lewis stands in that fatal tradition. It is time labor leaders learned that labor stands to gain in the long run by any measures which lower the cost of producing the necessities of life. Cheap St. Lawrence power is one of them.

*

SECRETARY OF WAR STIMSON WOULD HAVE to go far to find a worse adviser than Major General John F. O'Ryan. Until July 14 he was registered at the State Department as a representative of the Japanese Economic Federation. His record as a red-baiter when he was Police Commissioner of New York is even more disquieting. He resigned amid gales of laughter after the New York *Post* discovered that he was using Mrs. Dilling's "Red Network" as a guide. The *Post* printed the fact that the Police Commissioner's own boss, Mayor LaGuardia, was one of the suspects in the Dilling list. This is the man Stimson has chosen as his senior adviser!

*

AN INTERESTING TEST OF THE SUPPORT accorded the government's foreign policy will be offered by the special election to be held on August 29 to choose a successor to the late Representative Stephen Bolles of Wisconsin. At present ten men—seven Republicans, two Democrats, and one Progressive—have filed for nomination. Of the ten, nine hold the same isolationist views as the former incumbent. The tenth, however, is a man of national reputation and tested political strength—former Representative Thomas R. Amlie. Amlie has been a genuine liberal ever since his entry into politics during the Hoover era, and he was one of the few with vision enough to perceive the fascist menace in the days when it masqueraded as the Franco crusade in Spain. For his wisdom in such matters Amlie paid a heavy price. A few years ago he fell out with the La Follette Progressives, and the break cost him his seat in Congress. Later the President appointed him to the Interstate Commerce Commission, but Senate Tories caused enough unpleasantness to force him to withdraw. This time he is running for Congress as a regular Democrat, with Administration support. If, as seems certain, he beats his opponent in the Democratic primaries, he will have to face more than the two isolationist candidates, for it is reported that Wheeler and Lindbergh are planning to stump the state in an effort to lick Amlie at any cost. The opposition will be formidable, but there is reason to believe that sentiment in the Midwest is shifting; a victory for the Administration's foreign policy in Wisconsin would be certain evidence of its support everywhere.

"In Rising Wrath"

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

WINSTON CHURCHILL last week described the "temptations to optimism" that today assail the British people. "It is a fact," he said, "that mighty Russia, so treacherously assaulted, has struck back with such magnificent strength and courage and brought prodigious and well-deserved slaughter on the Nazi armies. The United States, the greatest single power, is giving us aid on a gigantic scale and is advancing in rising wrath and conviction to the very verge of war."

In those words, in the juxtaposition of Russia's successful resistance and America's "rising wrath," Mr. Churchill's magnificent sense of realism momentarily faltered. To those who watch the reactions of the people in this country at first hand, a contrary fact is apparent which offers no temptation to optimism: The greater the resistance of Russia, the more complacent becomes the attitude of the United States. Public opinion is not yet awake to the unchanging, fundamental dangers in the Nazi onslaught on civilization; it is still subject to vagaries, to sudden spurts of indignation and lapses into indifference. Today one can feel in the press and among people one meets a relaxation of tension, almost unconscious. Things are going pretty well; we have time to turn around and not too much immediately to worry about. This is the mood, not universal but general. The bloody and courageous resistance of Russia has created in America, not a determination to resist with equal courage and to take every advantage of the time offered by the struggle on the eastern front to increase the power of Britain and push the war in the west, but rather a sense of detachment. If Russia had gone down before the Nazi drive, this country would be far closer to the "verge of war" than it is today.

The American mind is itself the ready victim of optimism. If the Nazis and the Japanese were as clever as they sometimes seem, they would quit their propaganda of threatening invincibility and stick to their other theme of peace and harmlessness. Every time they have waved a fist under our nose—as when Japan joined the Axis to the accompaniment of threats against the United States, or Germany promised to sink American cargoes and American patrols—this country has moved to meet the challenge. Every time they have appeared to be stopped, however briefly, we too have stopped, adjusting quickly to the role of bystander and fixing our binoculars for a better view of an interesting but far-off spectacle.

This tendency is perhaps natural. Other nations have manifested it at other crucial moments of history, though never, perhaps, at a moment when all the forces of aggression and resistance were so fatally engaged. But if natural, it is also unutterably stupid and dangerous be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yond exaggeration. To allow even an hour's illusion of security to deflect us from the course necessary to win this war is more reckless than the most extreme act of violence. It is a paradox of the times we live in that complacency, not anger or alarm, is a sign of insanity.

I want to call the attention of our readers to Donald W. Mitchell's article in this issue of *The Nation*. Mr. Mitchell agrees with most other military observers that the decisive action of the war is still the battle to control the sea routes to Britain. And he marshals incontrovertible figures to show that "the war in the North Atlantic is still being lost." Ships bearing food and war supplies are being sunk faster than they can be replaced. Not only are the democratic nations failing to use this interval for aggressive counter-action, *they are not even holding their own.*

If Americans require danger to rouse their fighting spirit, to create the wrath out of which strong action emerges, let them consider this fact in all its implications —for us and for the world. What is necessary is a view which embraces the Russian front, and even the fast-gathering threat in the Pacific, along with the record of lost tonnage and insufficiently defended sea lanes in the Atlantic.

Toward the end of his discussion Mr. Mitchell asks the most pertinent question that faces this country today. He asks whether we can possibly act with sufficient energy and direction to save Britain—and so ourselves—without the spur of an actual declaration of war. He does not answer his own question, and indeed the answer does not exist. No one knows, not even the President, whether without a declaration of war the necessary measures, military and naval as well as economic, can be taken in time to save a day which is already drawing in.

So far the President has been able to command the instant support of the people for every major step he has taken. I believe he could go much farther and faster without losing that support. The apathy which attacks this country is not a symptom of fear or reluctance. It arises from lack of understanding, an inability to follow remote and complicated events without explanation and to arrive at bold positions without leadership. It is my profound belief that the President can create the necessary enthusiasm and support by merely exposing, continuously and very honestly, the dangers that lie immediately ahead. The people want and have a right to demand frankness; they need guidance. That is what political leadership is for in a democracy.

It is possible that nothing short of a declaration of war will awaken the country to an understanding that we are in any case involved in war and, as surely as Britain, face victory or defeat. If this is so, then a campaign should be undertaken to bring the truth home to the people. But before such a course is determined upon, the other policy should be fully exploited. The President should explain and then act; or act and then explain. He should adopt his own bold words in proclaiming an unlimited emergency as the animating force of his day-by-day policy.

He should tell the people what the situation of Britain demands of this country. And he should act upon that demand. If it means a system of full convoy instead of a patrol, he should order convoys. If it means shooting, he should order the navy to shoot. If it means the occupation of the Spanish and Portuguese islands or of Dakar, he should collaborate to that end with the British and the Free French. If it means the blockade of Japan or the defense of Thailand, he should act in the Far East. Whatever steps are required for the defeat of Hitler should be taken, as the strategy of the hour demands.

But the President will have to buttress his acts with the sort of courageous honesty that has made Churchill's leadership a work of genius. Under such leadership this country could be quickly brought to realize what we face and what we must do. Without it no effective measures can be adopted—least of all a declaration of war.

Call Japan's Bluff

JAPAN has taken over the military and economic resources of the whole of Indo-China as a result of last week's agreement with Vichy. Correspondents report that the military and naval forces sent to Saigon and other important points in the southern part of the country greatly exceed the numbers required for occupation and "protection" of this region. It is obvious that the Japanese have no intention of stopping there. Demands have already been made for bases and economic concessions in Thailand. Beyond Thailand lies Burma, the chief gateway for supplies for Free China.

In the weeks that have followed the setting up of Tokyo's new super-militaristic Cabinet, speculation has concerned itself chiefly with the direction of Japan's next move. Actually there has been only one direction in which it could move. A full-dress war against the Soviet Union is unlikely as long as the Soviets maintain an air force near Vladivostok capable of bombing the chief Japanese cities. And an attack on the Dutch East Indies, bringing Japan into open conflict with the United States and Britain, appears even less likely in view of the even greater air threat to the Japanese islands which this would entail. Indo-China was invaded because the Japanese reasoned correctly that such a move would not be taken as a cause of war by either the United States or Great Britain. Thailand is next on Japan's schedule because of a belief, which may be similarly well founded, that the democracies will still not resort to war unless Thailand itself resists. And Japan has already gained a sufficient political foothold in Thailand to make such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resistance unlikely. The recently announced economic accord under which the Thai government has agreed to extend several million dollars in credits to enable Japan to purchase Thai products may be taken as an indication of the extent of Japanese influence over the little kingdom. An important pro-British group also exists in Thailand, but it is not likely to gain the ascendancy unless Britain and the United States show that they are prepared to stop Japan.

That neither the freezing of Japanese funds nor the recent stoppage of the export of aviation gasoline is intended to be such a step is indicated in I. F. Stone's Washington letter on page 109. Japan will continue to get the oil and other war materials necessary for its invasion of China. Restriction of exports to the level ordinarily required for civilian uses merely means that civilian supplies will be diverted to military purposes. Our Far Eastern policy is still one of appeasement. Despite all the evidence to the contrary, it is assumed that Japan will fight if we really clamp down economically. This interpretation may be traced to one or two State Department "experts," men who profess to understand the "mysterious" workings of the Oriental mind. To the credit of the State Department as a whole, it must be said that not all the "experts" agree on this interpretation, but the appeasers still have the inside track.

A fully effective embargo on oil and other war supplies would stop Japan for the simple reason that it cannot fight without these strategic materials. There is not the slightest evidence that if these supplies were stopped, Japan would go berserk and provoke a war with the United States. On the contrary, Japanese policy during the past year and a half has been marked by increasing caution, particularly with regard to a clash with the United States. The Japanese-inspired press of Indo-China has taken great pains to point out that the United States is sympathetic with Japanese aspirations and that Britain alone is responsible for the threat to the French colony. The speed with which the Japanese government met American demands in the Tutuila case is indicative of Japanese terror of strong American action.

The United States could still prevent the seizure of Thailand if it would join with Great Britain in making it clear that further Japanese penetration would be resisted by force. Great Britain is undoubtedly ready for such a step. Its defenses in Singapore and Burma have been strongly reinforced by Australian troops and powerful R. A. F. units. Recent London dispatches indicate plainly that the British are considering the possibility of a counter-move in the event of a Japanese invasion of Thailand, but that they hesitate because of uncertainty about the United States. The same uncertainty in the minds of the Japanese may encourage the military to take risks which would find few supporters. A clearly announced firm stand by the two great Western democracies would in all probability stop Japan in its tracks. But if the appeasers are right and the Japanese militarists are mad enough to provoke war over Thailand, the democracies would still be in a far stronger strategic position if they resisted than if they allowed Thailand to suffer the fate of Indo-China.

Control Prices Now

THE attempt to control prices by ballyhoo has broken down. The stream of bright stories out of Washington about the "crackdown" on this or that group of producers has proved as misleading as similar stories on the records being set by the defense program. Mr. Roosevelt has long been the victim of a propaganda campaign intended to use the bogy of inflation against the spending policies of the New Deal. Now we find the President himself saying, in a plea for price-control legislation, "Nothing will sap the morale of this nation more quickly or ruinously than penalizing its sweat and skill and thrift by the individually undeserved and uncontrollable poverty of inflation."

Defense spending has increased demand; defense production has curtailed civilian supply. Inflation today *is* a danger, but the President may meet the most stubborn opposition from those who have talked most about it in the past eight years. Congressman Wolcott, ranking Republican member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, has attacked the Administration bill as "in line with the Tugwellian idea of socialization of industry." A Price Control Study Committee has been organized at the direction of House Republican Floor Leader Martin, and it will present its own program.

The Administration, leaving both farm prices and wages alone, seeks to establish price ceilings in industry. The huge rise in second-quarter profits—23 per cent for the first 250 companies to report—shows that neither increased taxes nor increased wages have interfered with profiteering. In steel, for example, despite wage increases, profits were up more than 50 per cent in the quarter. The Republican program is headed in a different direction. It seeks to take advantage of the fear of inflation, not to curb the prices and profits of industry, but to repeal the credit and monetary reforms of the New Deal and restore control of credit to private bankers. The measures suggested by the G. O. P. committee look toward higher interest rates and curtailed government spending to bring prices down. Though this can and will be defended by references to Adam Smith, the situation we face is as unlike that of classical economics as a Garand rifle is unlike a flintlock musket. Financial interests support this program because higher interest rates would increase their earnings. The Republican program would have no effect on either rising industrial profits or rising living costs. It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would add enormously to the cost of financing defense and war, and it would hamper the government's ability to act without consulting the wishes of the money market.

The figures cited by the President in his price-control measure are frightening, but they do not give an adequate picture of the rise in prices which affect the ordinary housewife and consumer. The basic-commodity index is up 50 per cent since the start of the war and 24 per cent since the first of the year. The wholesale-price index has risen 17½ per cent since August, 1939, and 10 per cent since January. These indices understate the impact of defense spending and defense production on the ordinary buyer. Retail prices have risen more sharply than wholesale. Many recorded prices of basic commodities—like aluminum—are deceptive, for premium prices must often be paid to "bootlegging" brokers to obtain delivery.

Mr. Roosevelt's price-control bill may not be ideal, but it is probably better than any that can be obtained from Congress. It is a pity that a "farm bloc," in which great corporate canning, sugar, and packing interests hide behind the overalls of the poor farmer, has already exacted 110 per cent of a fictitious "parity" in the bill as presented. As for wage controls, the experience of steel indicates that capacity operation for defense cuts unit labor costs so sharply as to more than take care of higher wages. It is quite true, as Mr. Roosevelt said, that "labor has far more to gain from price stability than from abnormal wage increases," but there is still leeway for a good many "normal" wage increases before that point is reached.

The control of prices is at once the most important and the most difficult task in the successful mobilization of our economy for defense or war. No nation, democratic or totalitarian, has entirely succeeded in eliminating price bootleggers, black bourses, and illicit dealings, but some form of price control is better than none at all. It may be that a combination of farm, Republican, and labor pressure will delay, denature, or even block the present measure. We think it will serve the best interests of both farmer and worker to place a ceiling on industrial prices and to do it quickly. This bill is a test of the ability of representative government to act with intelligence and foresight. Failure to control prices will create the suffering that goes with increased living costs, the disgust that accompanies the appearance of a new crop of "war millionaires," and the reaction that great capitalist interests know so well how to manipulate.

London—First Look

BY LOUIS FISCHER

London, August 3, by Cable

I SPENT twenty-four hours in Bermuda, twenty-eight in Horta, seventy-two in Lisbon, and arrived in London the Friday after the Saturday I had left New York. When I landed at the British airport a corporal inquired whether I had had a smooth flight, a sergeant brought out chairs, an officer insisted that we have a spot of tea, and all in all I felt as if I had arrived at a country estate for the week-end. This spirit prevails everywhere. My outstanding impression is one of excessive normality, friendly calm, and mutual solicitude.

As for air-raid destruction, I've seen one provincial town and London, both harrowing sights. The quietest residential sections have apparently been hit the most severely. I only have to walk down the street to see ample evidence of the deliberate bombing of civilians. Indeed, if the blitz, as air raids are called here, had continued with the ferocity of September, 1940, and May, 1941, perhaps the only thing left intact would be military objectives. Nevertheless, the air-raid damage is less than I had expected.

The British behaved magnificently during the raids, and they are proud of themselves. Each person has acquired a higher sense of his value. At my publisher's office the filing clerks, stenographers, and charwoman regularly stand fire-watch with the executives. A new camaraderie has developed. The corner newspaper vendor, with hairs growing from her warts, is air-raid warden and the heroine of her street. It all reminds me of the tonic effect of the first years of the Soviet revolution, when every man began to believe he was the salt of the earth, equal to all tasks, sharing all responsibilities, and therefore entitled to all rights.

Juan del Vayo, son of J. Alvarez del Vayo, tells me that during one raid he and another Spaniard ducked under a restaurant table. When they came up, an Englishman asked why they had done that. They replied that they thought it would be safer. "But what about your dignity?" the Englishman asked.

Owing to the exigencies of the war the quality of most things has deteriorated, but not that of the human being. Yet when one views the hideous effects of the bombings and watches millions groping through the blackout, one is bound to say that man is good but what a rotten world! Perhaps this partially explains why the high morale, the increased self-esteem, and the unfolding of new virtues and new capacities for resistance are not accompanied by any elation or release

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a national passion for change. Man is on the defensive against forces he cannot control. On several occasions when I asked what the British were thinking, I got a laugh as a reply. "We aren't thinking, we are surviving," I was told. This country is not future-conscious, and old-style politics bore even the professional politicians. At most people know what they don't want, but they have not given it much thought. These hundred weeks of war have been a terrible nightmare; they have been better than was anticipated but bad enough. Yet through it all it has never occurred to the average citizen that England could lose the war. They don't know how they will win, but they are sure they will.

Although, as Churchill said in this week's debate on production in Commons, the army is carnivorous and civilians herbivorous, the civilians feel that it is they who have been fighting this war so far—with the exception of the beloved R. A. F. They tell the story of a soldier who received a letter from his grandmother saying that she had just extinguished six incendiary bombs. London's "To the Trenches" signs shock one into the realization that all England is one huge Flanders battlefield with women and children and men in mufti in the front line. The army, however, and also the Home Guard are training intensively with good equipment. It is hoped that they will some day take the offensive. Churchill's warning of the necessity of continued vigilance against invasion is regarded here as his "No" to those who are demanding a large British military diversion on the Continent. I assume Churchill turned down this idea soon after the Russo-German war started, but that does not mean that the R. A. F. will not continue to blast Germany whenever the weather permits or that England has not sent direct aid to Russia.

Russia's participation in the war was enthusiastically welcomed here. At the moment of Britain's greatest trial and tragedy—after Dunkirk and during the big blitzes—when Britain's every effort was bent on keeping alive, the Communists scoffed, called it an imperialist war, and paid Hitler the compliment of comparing him with Churchill and Roosevelt. This left an indelible mark on the national psychology, and there is no mood even among the most radical Laborites to form a popular front, but the country is very happy that the Russians are fighting so well. The BBC's broadcasts are not simply pro-Russian but pro-Soviet, praising Soviet methods; and so are the news reels, which, however, leave the audiences silent.

Churchill's speech of June 23 embracing Russia as an ally garnered for him a mountain of congratulations. There was not and is not the slightest trend toward calling off the anti-Nazi war because the Nazis are fighting the Bolsheviks. Churchill's popularity is as high as Everest. He seems to know it, for various M. P.'s tell me that he has been manifesting an intolerance of parliamentary criticism. On the other hand, the Commons regards criticism as its God-given function. Churchill's appointment of his son-in-law, Duncan Sandys, to government office provoked many private and some public attacks. Churchill's speech this week on production was not his best, and he failed to reply to the charge of the Conservative member, Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne, that Britain was still 25 per cent short of its maximum war effort. The spirit of Dunkirk, when men and women remained at their factory lathes until they dropped from weakness, has not been recaptured, although labor leaders are cooperating whole-heartedly with the government. This reflects a good mood in the working class. My Labor friends in Parliament, both left and right, tell me that the workers are satisfied, that only the unemployables are now unemployed, and that working-class families are earning more money than ever before. Although rationing limits consumption, the M. P.'s declare that their Labor constituents are better situated than they were before the war.

Even those who defend Churchill passionately and would be distressed at any change in the premiership, nevertheless indulge in the altogether human sport of speculating on Churchill's successor. Anthony Eden is the first choice, Ernest Bevin second, Lord Beaverbrook third, and Sir Stafford Cripps fourth. But some put Cripps first. His prestige has risen enormously since the Russian war. He would be more acceptable to the ruling class than Bevin, whose sentences in the Commons are ungrammatical and who at a dramatic moment in the debate on production the other day said he would be proud to be an "unskilled laborer." "This is the people's war," Bevin added, and then turned to a Tory M. P. who had run down the dockers and called him a "cad." The fact that Bevin and Cripps are mentioned for the prime ministership when Labor is in a minority confirms the impression that party lines have been blurred by the war and that the present coalition is more than a political makeshift.

Meanwhile London is still guessing at the identity of the European neutral which, according to Sumner Welles, will soon be involved in the war. My first thought was Turkey. Hitler would attempt to induce the Turks to take Batum and Baku. But Spain is the second possibility. It is obvious now that Hitler seriously believed England would withdraw from the war if he attacked Russia. With this expectation dashed and military difficulties accumulating, Hitler needs some propaganda trump which will show that Europe as a whole is, nevertheless, fighting Bolshevism. Spain's entry would be such a trump, and Franco might consider this a favorable moment because it would not bring a Nazi invasion of Spain. Portugal, however, has been evacuating its tiny army to the Azores, the Cape Verde Islands, and Angola so that it won't get hurt.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Oil on the Pacific

BY I. F. STONE

Washington, August 3

TO ALL those fellow-Americans ashamed of the part our exports have played in fueling the Japanese war machine I offer here a few words of warning and suggestion:

1. Do not take at face value the headlines and the talk of our having imposed an oil "embargo" on Japan. The forces of appeasement are as strongly intrenched in the State Department as ever. When Sumner Welles was asked whether the freezing of Japanese credits in this country meant an embargo on oil, he replied that every transaction would be considered individually and on its merits. This may sound like "hut sut" gibberish to you, but Japanese diplomacy understands it. It means that there will be licensing and bargaining and that we are still receptive to a "deal" of some kind in the southern Pacific.

2. It is important that the greatest possible pressure be brought to bear for an embargo on all war materials to Japan because the President committed a historic blunder when he told civilian-defense volunteers we had to sell oil to Japan to keep it from seizing the Dutch East Indies. This translates bitterly into Chinese, for it says that we were content to fuel the bombers that mangled China's children as long as Japan kept out of the rich imperialist preserves in the Indies. This was the "plague o' both your houses" of our Far Eastern diplomacy. I know the President, a humane and good man, does not feel that way, but no one can deny that this is exactly what his policy toward the Sino-Japanese struggle has been. If Japan wins in China, its propagandists will use this against us. If China wins, it will leave an ugly memory. China's 400,000,000 people will some day play a great role again in world affairs, and their friendship will be worth far more to our children than the wealth of the Indies.

3. One way to make amends for a callous statement that does not reflect America's feelings toward China is to write your Congressman and Senators and the White House to give China the thirty-five transport planes promised it. Our appeasement of both Vichy and Tokyo has smoothed the path of the Japanese army to French Indo-China, from which the Burma road can be blasted. These 35 transport planes could do the work of 850 trucks, and they could be obtained at once by requisitioning them from American airlines. That would be a sacrifice, but it is time we made some little sacrifice for the millions who have been fighting our battle in the East while our oil, copper, and steel barons made a profit on the blood they lost.

4. Don't worry too much about the Dutch East Indies. They are quite a handful, and the Japanese cannot just pick them up for the asking. Yokohama is as far from Batavia as New York is from Cherbourg. If the Dutch East Indies were laid across the United States they would reach from New York into Wyoming and from the Canadian border at Montana south into Mexico beyond El Paso, Texas. The task of conquering these huge and populous isles would be a heavy strain on Japan. Unfortunately, the longer we appease Tokyo the easier we make its task of seizing the Indies, for with every step it comes closer to them and is better supplied with war materials for the attack.

5. Mr. Roosevelt's rationalization of our oil sales to Japan is subject to heavy discount. We have been supplying about two-thirds of Japan's oil; a fourth has come from the Indies. Japan seems to have been taking most of the islands' oil output. Even if Japan seized the islands and the American and British-Dutch oil companies which own them were too unpatriotic to destroy the wells, possession of the Indies would not undo the crippling effects of an American oil embargo. Oil is only one of the four principal imports from America which have been essential to the Japanese war machine. The other three are scrap iron, machine tools, and copper. None of these are available in any quantity in the Indies. We are now suffering from serious shortages of all three. If we sold oil to Japan to keep it from seizing the Indies, why did we sell it scrap iron? To keep it from seizing Pittsburgh?

6. An embargo on these and other war materials is now necessary, not to defend the Chinese people, but to defend the American people. Further licensing provisions are useless. Machine tools were on the first list of articles placed under license in July of last year, but in March of this year we sent Japan more than $1,000,000 worth of machine tools. Full priorities have just been imposed here by the OPM on copper, and there is a great to-do in the press about our buying up Chile's copper to keep it out of the hands of Japan. Yet in the first quarter of this year we sent more copper to Japan and Manchoukuo than in the first quarter of last year.

7. There is no way of knowing what has happened to our exports to Japan since March. Neither State Department nor Export Control has ever given out the details, and one has had to wait for the Commerce Department's figures. On May 29, five days after the publication of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quarterly report on Far Eastern trade from which my figures were obtained, the Commerce Department ceased publication of commodity exports by countries. Since publicity alone has forced the State Department's hand in the past, secrecy will encourage further appeasement. A nation-wide fight must be organized against this most vicious kind of secret diplomacy.

8. I have listened to complex strategical explanations by the hour but remain convinced that our failure to impose embargoes goes back to the simple proposition that there was too much money to be made on the Japanese war trade. The United States Socony-Vacuum and the British Rising Sun Petroleum Company control the major oil-distributing companies of Japan under idyllic circumstances which permit them, in the quaint language of a Japanese publication, to "avoid the inconveniences of competition." An oil embargo would have disrupted their business, and the truth is that the real argument put forward in our State Department by our oil companies has been that "if we don't sell this oil to the Japanese, the British will." It is well to remember that the British are in danger of losing their empire because they so long permitted this kind of business-as-usual to interfere with their war effort.

9. It is true that we need rubber and tin from the Indies, but that fact is a sour reflection on the Administration's delay in building stockpiles of rubber and tin (as of silk) while Japan built up stockpiles of American oil and scrap. The one way to assure a supply of rubber and tin is to establish bases at once in the Indies and prepare to defend them against Japanese attack.

10. Remember finally that the responsibility for this mess of flabby thinking and bloody profit rests on the President. I am reliably informed that at the joint meetings of OPM, Export Control, Army-Navy Ordnance, and State Department the votes have been almost always three to one against licensing more exports to Japan. The one vote for Japan has been cast by the State Department, and Secretary Hull has usually gone to the White House and obtained the President's support and licenses have been approved. America's honor and America's defense are at stake in the embargo question, and only a roar of disapproval from the country can put a stop to the appeasement shame.

Britain's Danger Grows

BY DONALD W. MITCHELL

IT IS one of the ironies of the present war that its most vital front rarely makes the headlines. The Russian campaign is undeniably important news, and success on the eastern front would make Germany infinitely stronger economically and much less vulnerable to blockade, at present Britain's strongest weapon. But the Russian campaign will not be the decisive campaign of this war. The lines which must be held if Britain is to win are those followed by commercial shipping over the three-quarters of the globe covered with water. The most vital sector of British sea communications is the area within a few hundred miles of Ireland, where sea lanes from all parts of the world converge into a narrow bottleneck before entering various English ports. From 60 to 75 per cent of Britain's food and industrial supplies comes from abroad, and success in the unspectacular, grinding war of attrition being waged by German submarines, surface raiders, and airplanes would so diminish Britain's powers of resistance as to conclude the European phase of World War II.

Therefore the most important question of the war is simply: What do Britain's losses of merchant tonnage mean in terms of its staying power? Can present losses be reduced; and if not, how long can the British Empire stand?

The monthly figures of ship sinkings, now no longer available, have been an incomplete index to the progress of the struggle at sea. Prior to the beginning of 1941 losses were kept within controllable limits by replacements: ships of defeated allies were pressed into service, old ships were bought from the United States, and new ones were produced in English yards. The toll of destroyed submarines was high, and World War methods with their improvements gave promise of being effective despite the much smaller naval forces available.

Then, early in 1941, a change occurred; the Germans began to make use of bases in all parts of Europe, and the new Folke-Wulf bombers, especially designed for Atlantic operations, came into quantity production. The increased number of U-boat bases decreased the effectiveness of the mine fields, blockade, and other countermeasures employed in 1918, and the British were largely reduced to bombing bases from the air, a line of action which attained only moderate success owing to the wide dispersion of the targets. The German raids on shipping became much more difficult to cope with. Losses for 1941 threatened to reach 3,500,000 or even 5,500,000 tons at a time when expected replacements from British and American yards did not amount to 2,000,000. In April even these expected losses were left far behind as the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germans destroyed 581,000 tons of shipping, bringing the rate to between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 tons a year.

During the past three months conditions have favored the British. Driven by fear of an imminent German victory, the United States has enormously enlarged and speeded up its shipping program, formed a pool of domestic shipping for transfer to the British, extended its so-called neutrality patrol over most of the North Atlantic, and forestalled possible German moves in the direction of Greenland and Iceland. Against the advice of many of his admirals President Roosevelt has almost certainly transferred powerful units of the Pacific fleet to the Atlantic to aid in reporting submarines and raiders. More American patrol planes have been delivered to the British to deal with German bombers in the waters of the war zone. The destruction of the Bismarck and the crippling bomb attacks on the Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and Prinz Eugen have greatly decreased the threat of surface raiders. The British shipbuilding program, as well as our own, has been speeded up to the point where the Maritime Commission audibly hopes for 3,000,000 tons this year. Also, as Americans now realize, German air activities and industrial production have mainly been keyed to the Russian campaign rather than to the destruction of British shipping.

Yet despite these favorable conditions the war in the North Atlantic is still being lost and by about as large a margin as was the case six months ago. Ship losses for April and May were among the highest of the war. It is true that figures for June showed a considerable drop, but they were not complete and under the new British policy of secrecy will not be made so later. In short, losses are quite likely to reach 6,000,000 tons a year or even more—and this on the basis of the usually accurate British figures, which run far below the claims of the Germans. Despite greatly increased British and American defense activities, the margin of losses above replacements, the figure which best indicates how fast Hitler is winning the war, has remained about the same or even been slightly increased. And no military or naval expert believes that the German offensive has reached its climax.

We have no absolutely accurate indication of what these losses mean to the British. Perhaps not a dozen men in the world could authoritatively answer the question: How long can Britain stand? But despite a censorship which conceals most of the pertinent facts, certain signs point to the extremity in which Britain finds itself.

To some extent it is possible to judge its staying power by World War experience. Up to May, 1917, merchant ship losses totaled 7,500,000 tons, and both British and Germans expected sinkings of 1,000,000 tons a month. Experts calculated that 6,000,000 more tons lost, 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 in excess of replacements, would spell British surrender—to prevent starvation—by November, 1917. The situation existing today is not entirely dissimilar. Again total sinkings have reached approximately 7,500,000 tons. With losses of about 350,000 tons a month over replacements, Great Britain will face an increasingly hard time through 1941 but should last into 1942, by which time both replacements and other forms of American aid can be obtained on a rising scale. This estimate is more optimistic than that made by some experts, who have seen British resistance lasting only to the late fall of 1941, or at most into early 1942.

There are, needless to say, many ifs involved. History never repeats itself in exact detail, and the present setup does not offer a complete analogy to 1917. The United States has been more conscious of the British plight and has offered more aid; much Allied tonnage has fallen into British hands. Has it merely replaced similar tonnage trading with the British Isles prior to the war? Has it more than afforded compensation, or is it inadequate? No one has given an answer. On the other hand, the problem of routing shipping for trade purposes is infinitely more serious than in 1917 and 1918 because the Mediterranean is closed and the usual markets and sources of raw materials in Europe have had to be replaced by others more distant and less convenient. Not included in loss figures are damaged ships which are out of use for varying lengths of time. Disablements are more numerous now than actual sinkings, for aerial bombs, unlike torpedoes, are more frequently damaging than fatal. The tonnage temporarily unavailable because damaged is certainly greater than in the World War.

Possibly reports of shortages of raw materials afford a better indication of approaching exhaustion than figures on ship losses. As far back as February the New York *Times* reported that the British were dipping deeply into reserve stocks of certain raw materials and that current monthly imports were failing by as much as 20 per cent to meet consumption needs.

About the only war essential whose shortage is accurately revealed in the news is oil. During 1917 and 1918 the Germans sank enough tankers to threaten gravely the British oil supply. At one time the stored surplus was so small that old coal-burning battleships rather than modern ships consuming oil were sent by the United States as reinforcements to the Grand Fleet. Apparently this oil crisis was not discovered by the German Intelligence Service, for no special effort was made to sink tankers, nor did the German fleet engage in operations designed to force the Grand Fleet into a heavy expenditure of oil. It is absolutely certain that a similar shortage is being felt at present. Transportation of oil from the Near East through the Mediterranean has become impossible and has aggravated an already acute problem. The recent transfer of fifty United States tankers to British registry, at the risk not only of antagonizing Latin American countries, some of which may find them-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves entirely deprived of oil, but also of creating a shortage on our own East Coast, shows very clearly that Britain is again desperately hard up for oil. The impending transfer of a hundred more tankers, for which Britain has asked, is a step which only an emergency of the first magnitude could justify.

Food rationing can be overestimated as an indication of British collapse. Yet the new restrictions have gone beyond discomfort and inconvenience and, according to physicians, are coming dangerously close to the point of reducing war and industrial efficiency.

Much controversy has taken place in and out of Congress with regard to the percentage of American aid which has failed to reach its destination. An estimate of 40 per cent sunk is of course ridiculously high. If 40 per cent of all shipments across the Atlantic had gone to the bottom, Great Britain would long since have been knocked out of the war. But even the 4 per cent sinkings claimed by isolationists would as certainly, if more slowly, spell British defeat in the present war, for the slower freighters make at least half a dozen trips in the course of a year and most ships considerably more. If we multiply the 4 per cent losses by eight, as the average number of trips a year, we have a third of the British merchant marine being destroyed in the course of a year. And this, strangely enough, is almost the exact proportion of British losses. On some routes losses or diversions of tonnage due to losses elsewhere have been even greater. Prominent New Zealanders in the United States assert that over 40 per cent of the ships normally plying between Great Britain and Australasia have been either sunk or diverted to other routes.

Clearly, debate about the proportion of American aid lost in the Atlantic is of little present value. The basic figures upon which Britain's power to survive and ultimately take the offensive are dependent are the twin indices of losses and replacements. Unless the two lines, now far apart on the shipping graph, are brought closer together and ultimately cross, as actually happened in consequence of the mass production of American shipyards in 1918, the war will be lost, whether in 1941, 1942, or still later.

Preliminary signs of a coming British defeat will be seen in a reduction in imports of steel and oil and planes, a gradual decrease in the intensity of the war effort, and an increasing inability to take the offensive. To some extent symptoms of this sort are already visible. Sufficient shipping has simply not been available to supply a *large* army in the Near East with the tools of mechanized warfare. The *Times* reports instances in which steel has been left on American docks by British vessels which have loaded food instead. In all recent campaigns by British troops the final margin of strength needed to turn defeat into victory has been lacking.

Luckily, we are very far from having reached the ultimate high point of our aid to Britain. In the past few months we have done some of the things needed to save the democratic cause. We have hesitated to take other steps which in view of the present situation appear indispensable because they would mean the end of a war of limited liability and would definitely bring shooting.

To be effective, our shipbuilding must be even further hastened and expanded. The existing program is really better than it looks, particularly from the standpoint of quality. Even the "ugly ducklings" will be faster, handier, and better built ships than some of the steel, wood, and concrete "ninety-day wonders" turned out in 1918 and 1919. But despite recent improvements ships are still not being built fast enough. Lack of shipways need not be an obstacle, for granted a suitable waterfront and requisite materials, ways can be constructed almost overnight. In fact, even now the Great Lakes yards are largely unused. Today we are short of skilled and supervisory labor and somewhat short of steel; in 1917 we were short of everything, and our industrial and shipbuilding capacity was much more limited than in 1938. Yet in 1918 and 1919 we turned out nearly 8,000,000 tons of new shipping, a feat then regarded as an industrial miracle. It may be necessary to perform a second miracle of rapid shipbuilding if World War II is not to be lost.

In providing naval aid most of the more obvious steps have been taken. The President at considerable risk has transferred most of the navy's patrol vessels to the Atlantic, replacing them in the Philippine Islands, British Malaya, and the Netherlands Indies by a force of formidable long-range bombers. The Norfolk navy yard is busy converting merchant ships into plane carriers for the Atlantic patrol. Our increased production of big bombers and patrol flying boats will make existence increasingly miserable for German U-boats, though the use of these same ships to stiffen convoys would give greater results. The British have employed patrols in both wars, but until they also adopted the convoy system they were losing the First World War. Unless we are willing to take the risks implied in convoys, ultimate victory may well elude us.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle to adequate aid to Britain and to our own defense is psychological. Our people are not emotionally united; some see little danger, others are unwilling to pay the price of a genuine all-out effort. Throughout our history we have often revealed this attitude, refusing to take war or defense very seriously unless actually engaged in hostilities. If, then, only the spur of conflict will goad us to supreme effort, we should be much better off today if formally at war. For unless a united America makes a supreme effort, we may have to defend ourselves by fighting, not in the enemy's territory, where Hitler, unlike Lindbergh, prefers to fight his wars, but in the Western Hemisphere, against the might of a united Europe led by a resentful and victorious Germany.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

My Friend Marx Dormoy

BY PIERRE COT

MY FRIEND Marx Dormoy is dead. The former Minister of the Interior in the Popular Front government, the Ickes of the Third Republic, has been assassinated in his "forced residence"—that is to say, his prison. He was killed by the explosion of a bomb which could not have been placed under his bed without the complicity of his guards.

For those who know French politics the crime bears a signature. There can be no doubt that it was committed by the Cagoulards, the famous Hooded Men whose fascist plot Marx Dormoy exposed in 1937 and whose leaders he had arrested. Their arrest followed a criminal bombing of the headquarters of the French Industrialists' Organization, in which two policemen were killed. Employing the well-known Reichstag-fire tactics, the fascist press placed the blame on the Communists. But an official inquiry launched by Marx Dormoy led straight to the Cagoulards, an organization which brought together, under the direction of General Dusseigneur and Colonel Deloncle, the most active fascist elements. For this the Cagoulards swore vengeance.

Marx Dormoy

Today the leaders of the Cagoule are in power. General Dusseigneur, whom I dismissed from the air force, is dead; but Colonel Deloncle has been charged by Marshal Pétain with organization of the "Legion," the new official fascist party. Another leader of the Cagoule, Dumoulin de Labarthete, has become the director of the Marshal's civil cabinet, while still another, Commander Loustalot-Lacau, holds the post of director of his military cabinet. Everywhere the new fascist police has been organized under the direction of the hooded men.

Certain distinguishing marks on the bomb used by the Cagoulards in the 1937 affair enabled Marx Dormoy to expose their plot; today Marx Dormoy, the enemy of the Cagoule, lies dead, killed by a bomb. The crime bears a signature!

The time is not yet come to write the history of this secret organization, which had powerful protectors in high military circles and which played the most important role in the betrayal of France by fascism. Today I want rather to tell a little about Marx Dormoy and discuss the questions his death has raised.

The Cagoulards hated Marx Dormoy not only because he had caused the arrest of their leaders. Even more, they hated him because he was one of the most influential leaders of French democracy. He entered public life as mayor of a great industrial town, an office in which he demonstrated his talents as a skilled administrator, a sound thinker, and an uncompromising leader. In June, 1936, he became Under Secretary of State in the Blum Cabinet. In 1937 the fascist press began the ignoble campaign that drove Roger Salengro, Minister of the Interior, to suicide; I witnessed the slow agony of that unhappy man who at last, exhausted by the struggle against calumny, preferred death to the wickedness of the French fascists. Marx Dormoy was chosen to fill his place in the Interior. In this post he not only fought with all his strength against those who were preparing to betray French democracy, but in the Popular Front he proved himself one of the supporters of the Spanish Republic. If his policy had been followed—resistance to fascism at home, support of democracy abroad—France would not have fallen so low.

The murder of Dormoy calls for other reflections of a more general nature. This assassination is no doubt only the first in the series of political crimes which the new masters of France have mapped; before the whole story is told, France will have known all the shames and ignominies of fascism. After the concentration camps and anti-Semitic crusades will come the political assassinations—the murder of Dormoy follows the familiar pattern of the Matteotti killing. Still later will come the settlement of accounts between the rival "gangs" who are fighting for power. And lest you think I am exaggerating: in November, 1940, Pierre Laval was already planning to have Marshal Pétain kidnapped; in July, 1941, Marshal Pétain ordered the arrest of Tixier-Vignancourt, one of his close collaborators, because he had dared to criticize the age, the policy, or the lack of policy of the Marshal.

Thus by the murder of Dormoy the moral decadence of the Vichy regime stands exposed. It is not only to Hitler that the Pétain government has delivered France; it is to hatred. Hatred is rising everywhere. The military dictatorship in France, as in Spain, is rooted in hatred;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in both countries one of the most delicate problems of the post-war period will be to prevent an outburst of vengeance, to teach the people once again that there is no justice without pity, no democracy without tolerance.

But the assassination of Dormoy is proof as well that the democratic spirit and the anti-fascist flame still live in France. Marx Dormoy was murdered not for vengeance alone; he was murdered because the fascists feared him and the forces of which he was a symbol. Even in the midst of my grief at the death of my friend I see a ray of hope. The very fact that the fascists must murder its champions is proof that democracy will live again.

Conscience Under the Draft

BY ROGER N. BALDWIN

ALTHOUGH throughout the past year conscientious objectors to military service have received surprisingly sympathetic treatment, the conflict between conscience and the state still presents unsolved problems. These problems could have been wholly avoided, as they were in England, where not a single genuine objector has been imprisoned, if Congress had been willing to recognize the uncompromising opponents of war and exempt them from any compulsory service. There is only a handful of these objectors, but they dramatize out of all proportion to their number the conflict between conscription and conscience.

Two hundred of them have been tried and sentenced to prison for refusing to register, some for the maximum of five years, and about twenty more await trial. While most of them rest their refusal on the irreconcilability of conscription with Christian teaching, a few are war-resisters on socialist or internationalist grounds. Many are Protestant ministers and theological students who spurned the exemption given them in the law and insisted on being treated like other objectors.

It was the announced intention of the draft authorities that no genuine objector should be sent to prison. But there can be no question that every one of the 200 men sentenced or awaiting trial is the most transparently genuine objector that could possibly be found. It is argued that the men courted prosecution by an unreasonable obstinacy in refusing the simple requirement of registration. But that overlooks the fact that theirs was a protest at the initial point of conflict against a law which allowed no exemption from some form of compulsory service.

Before the day of registration last October the authorities were urged to avoid the issue of refusal to register by accepting the identification and statements of men who presented themselves to the draft boards. Attorney General Jackson was at first of a mind to do so, as was the director of the selective-service law, Clarence Dykstra. But fear of criticism and reluctance to encourage objectors overcame their inclinations. Now after a year's experience the authorities have come around to the wisdom of their original view, and in the regulations for the registration of men reaching twenty-one have provided that those presenting themselves and refusing, as objectors, to register shall be automatically registered anyhow. Thus the government at last virtually confesses error in its prosecutions of 200 men. The error is somewhat mitigated by the undoubted necessity of prosecution for further non-compliance in filling out questionnaires, but the initial conflict over the technical point of refusal to register could have been avoided.

All along the authorities have been uneasy over the presence in prison of obviously sincere war-resisters and have done their utmost to get them out by special and early paroles designed to fit their consciences. Most of the prisoners have accepted the government's offers of parole to work camps for conscientious objectors run by the historically pacifist churches, reckoning that service as part of their sentences, but some have resolutely refused to leave prison on any terms. A few will probably be paroled to individual service outside the work camps, in accordance with the law's provision that they may be assigned to any work of national importance. One minister, sentenced to three years for refusing to register, has been paroled to another pastorate in the same state.

Further prosecutions are in the offing. More than 600 men have appealed from their local boards' refusal to recognize them as objectors, and most of those whose objections are found not genuine by the reviewing authorities of the Department of Justice will doubtless continue their resistance to military service. Prosecution is the government's only recourse under the law, though continued resistance is in favor of the objector's good faith and will tend to bring a reconsideration of his case.

Another group that appears likely to face prosecution is made up of men who oppose their assignment to work camps under private religious auspices because they are obliged to maintain themselves there at $35 a month or to accept charity for their maintenance. They argue that the government has given them a legal status, and that, like soldiers, they should receive maintenance and pay from the government while they do work of national im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portance. The government was originally willing to make such an arrangement but accepted instead the project of the religious bodies, whose members objected to government-controlled services. Some men are non-religious and do not relish the atmosphere of religious work camps, and a number have indicated their intention of declining this form of service.

The area of conflict could be much reduced if the authorities would provide more individual service outside the work camps. During the First World War several thousand objectors were furloughed from the army under civilian control to jobs of national importance in agriculture or with the Friends' reconstruction work abroad. They found their own jobs and were permitted to receive pay equal to a soldier's. In England objectors are permitted to find their own work in certain prescribed occupations regarded as of national importance, and to retain their earnings. Many are allowed to continue in their own jobs if these are held to be of national importance. Fear of adverse criticism from the parents and friends of drafted men has prevented any such solution here, though it is entirely practicable under the law.

But however liberal the authorities may be and however anxious to make adjustments, not all genuine objectors can be kept out of prison until Congress provides for total exemption, as in England, for the few who cannot in conscience accept any conscripted service. Congress would presumably be less hostile to this suggestion now than it was a year ago, when it opposed such a provision for fear that Communists and Bundsmen might take advantage of it. Not a single Communist or Bundsman is registered as an objector. No slacker has turned up as one. The absolutists are mostly modernist Christians with high social ideals. Pressures for conformity are so great, objectors are so few, absolutists are so obviously genuine, coercion is so plainly futile that every consideration of public policy should impel a reasonable way out of the present impasse. The government has done so well that it ought to be able to do better.

The new system is an improvement over that in force during the World War in that it removes objectors from contact with the military authorities, affords protection by the machinery of appeals, generously interprets "religious training and belief" to cover all sorts of conscientious scruples (except opposition to particular wars), and attempts to avoid prosecutions. Both Mr. Dykstra and his successor, Brigadier General Lewis B. Hershey, have sought all possible alternatives to prosecution, though they have often been caught in situations which they could have avoided by anticipating them. Assistant Attorney General Linton Collins, in charge of appeals under the supervision of the Assistant to the Attorney General, Matthew F. McGuire, has enlisted the volunteer services of distinguished civilians in hearing the often difficult cases of objectors not recognized by their local boards.

In prosecutions the Department of Justice has inclined to leniency and has recommended maximum prison sentences of a year and a day, comparable with army service. Some intemperate federal judges, however, have ignored the recommendation and fixed sentences as high as the law allows, namely, five years; a lenient judge, on the other hand, pronounced a sentence of one hour for refusal to register, and other judges have limited the term to a few months. This disparity of sentences for what is in fact the same offense can be corrected only through commutations by the President.

Every man sentenced, whether to an hour or a day or a year, loses his rights of citizenship as a felon and can have them restored only by Presidential action. In the World War no man lost his rights of citizenship through a conviction in the courts for violation of the draft act, since this was only a misdemeanor, with the maximum penalty of a year. Now, in days more intolerant of dissent and more fearful of non-conformity, it has been raised to the status of a major crime. No slacker seeking to save his skin could be treated more severely under the law than have been the earnest Christians—and a few others—who have received the maximum five-year term.

For the great majority of objectors the system works to meet their scruples. Of the estimated 6,000 objectors registered in the first draft, most indicated their willingness to accept non-combatant service in the army; those called to service have put on the uniform and been assigned to kitchen police or hospital work. Some 2,000 who refused non-combatant service have gone to the private religious work camps or are awaiting assignment to them; another 600 who were refused recognition by their local boards are in process of examination by the appeals machinery of the Department of Justice. Conflict as yet is limited to the 200 men who have been tried or are awaiting trial for refusal to submit to conscripted service of any sort.

Will our government continue to treat such objectors as felons or will it, as the British government has done in this war, recognize that they are entitled to dissent and to undertake voluntary social service in lieu of military service? The argument for a total-exemption provision has a sounder basis than the necessity of accommodating a few consciences. Conscription is always regarded in democratic countries as a deplorable necessity. The force of the arguments against it is lessened by a recognition of the moral right to exemption from all conscripted service of those who on conscientious grounds would resist to the point of prison. The essence of freedom of religion is the right of men to follow the dictates of an authority higher than the state. Total exemption alone leaves room for duty to God. Imprisonment of men for placing duty to God above the demands of the state is an unanswerable indictment of our professions of religious freedom. Such considerations won the total-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exemption provision in the British conscription act; they should enlist like support here.

Already the draft act provides for total exemption of one class of men—the clergy and theological students. If exemption is valid for them on the ground of their relationship to higher sanctions than the state's, it is valid for men who do not happen to follow their calling but who are equally bound by conscience. We have recognized the principle in law. It remains only to apply it fully and logically.

Hitler and the Decalogue

BY RUSTEM VAMBERY

ACCORDING to a Latin proverb, if two people are doing the same thing it is not the same. In spite of the resemblance between the Kaiser's and Hitler's "drive to the East," the methods by which Hitler hopes to achieve his ends are very different from those used by the Kaiser. It is true that the Kaiser, in observing the precepts of international law, may have been hypocritical, but his hypocrisy was a compliment paid to virtue. Hitler, by refusing to recognize Christian civilization as the basis of the law of nations, denies virtue itself.

In the Nazi doctrine honor is an exclusively Germanic attribute, and if the dictator breaks his solemn promise, he asserts that the rupture of any pact or treaty is justified when the interest of the state requires it. Fascist-Nazi ideas of law, particularly of international law, differ essentially from those of more backward forms of government, including the "pluto-democracies." For the democracies all law ends where violence begins; for the dictators might and right are identical, and their "international law" merely puts into traditional shape the results of violence. Kant ridiculed the jurists, who were unable to agree upon their concept of law, but whatever it may be, law makes no sense unless it is the self-restraint of power, the protection of the weak against the strong. All power may have originated in violence, but it became law only when the memory of violence faded away. In the Fascist-Nazi order violence is still synonymous with law. Law cannot dispense with coercion—at least coercion must be in the background—because, as the French adage has it, *"Le juge sans le gendarme serait un pauvre sire."* But coercion, having a legal background and a moral objective, must not be equated with violence. The Nazis have left the goddess of justice only her sword and have knocked from her other hand the scales. The only "moral" objective which they recognize is the unbridled, omnipotent state. This results in a legal code which the omnipotent state uses purely to protect its own omnipotence. In such twaddle ends the definition of what is termed law in Germany.

There is still less reason to accept the Nazis' false conception of international law. Whoever wants peace has to submit to German domination—this is the essence of Hitler's international order. The problem confronting any theory of international law is how the disorder created by "totalitarian" aggression can be fitted into a legal settlement. Peace treaties are instruments of international law and make sense only if the contracting parties recognize their binding moral force. It is an age-old question whether the rules of international law are legal or moral rules, whether international law is, indeed, law at all. The answer to this question depends entirely on the definition of law we wish to accept. In John Austin's opinion international law is not positive law at all but a branch of positive morality; Hans Kelsen finds its legal character in the unity of the system, in view of which the lack of coercion is but secondary; a leading German authority, G. A. Walz, insists that it is genuine law, but law presenting "strong peculiarities."

Whatever view we accept, we must admit that morality and cultural background are of paramount importance in the fulfilment of any obligation entered into under the terms of international law. "Only a very gloomy pessimist," says J. L. Brierley, "would fail to recognize that common moral and cultural standards do exist internationally, that they influence conduct between nations, and that this community of sentiments, imperfect though it is, affords some basis for law." This international morality includes, according to Charles G. Fenwick, those principles of justice to which the rules *should* conform whether they actually do or not. Secretary of State Hull, therefore, touched the heart of the whole problem when in his address before the Bar Association of Tennessee in 1938 he stressed the fact that international law depends for its effectiveness primarily upon the two great moral forces of self-restraint and public opinion.

It would be wasting words to prove that the Nazi *Weltanschauung* is absolutely different from that of Western civilization. Not even the Nazis themselves claim that what they call morality is in harmony with the ethical system which has evolved from the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount. They admit the triumph of sovereignty over the law and uphold a "moral" order the aim of which is submissiveness to "a nation of Jesuits serving, not the Vicar of Christ, but the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Führer." Our morality is based on the principle of "love thy neighbor"; theirs declares *mors tua vita mea* unless you are a member of the Nazi Party or willing to be enslaved to further German dominance. The numerous and flagrant violations of recognized principles of international law of which the Nazis have been guilty are not so important as the fact that their moral rules are entirely different from the code of civilized nations. Such a fundamental difference would make a peace treaty with Hitler wholly illusory.

In a recent book by Henry M. Wriston we are told that this objection to a negotiated peace is not new. Churchill simply repeats what Wilson said of the Kaiser and what Metternich said a century before: "Peace with Napoleon is not peace." However, Napoleon and the Kaiser, military-minded believers in force though they were, still lived on the same spiritual and moral plane as their enemies. President Roosevelt, therefore, had better justification than Metternich or Wilson when he declared last December: "We know that a nation can have peace with the Nazis only at the price of total surrender." Those who are clamoring for a negotiated peace should at least openly confess that they are ready to indorse the only peace Hitler would accept on the basis of his present military triumphs—the surrender of the world to the domination of the master-race. And, further, they should declare that they are prepared to be responsible, as accessories after the fact, for the murder of human dignity and civil liberty.

Madariaga in one of his misleading books reminds the readers of "Don Quixote" that even in an association of brigands the virtue of justice is indispensable in the distribution of the spoils. This kind of justice will do when peace has to be maintained among brigands, but the problem is more complicated when brigands have to be reconciled with their victims. Law is possible not only among robbers but, as we know from the "Jungle Book," in the animal world, too. Yet not even Kipling's imagination went so far as to suggest a negotiated peace between men and the beasts of the jungle.

In the Wind

A NEW SOURCE of Nazi propaganda will be an international labor front modeled to a large extent on the League of Nations' International Labor Office. A labor review similar to the one issued by the I. L. O. is now being distributed in several of the conquered countries and will soon appear throughout Latin America. It is reported that Henri de Man, renegade radical now proselytizing Belgium and French workers for the Nazis, will play an important part in the organization that is being built.

ACCORDING TO the food columns of the New York *Times*, the expelled Italian consuls who sailed on the West Point recently took home with them 400 pounds of American-made spaghetti.

FROM THE CURRENT ISSUE of *Scribner's Commentator:* "Soldiers of Finland! In your hour of trial you may continue to count on the loyal friendship of the Christian American majority. . . . America will not betray her future generations by joining hands with godless Soviet Russia against your democracy and our own. Thumbs up, Finland!"

FROM THE GERMAN BROADCAST of August 4, 1940: "Even the greatest skeptics will now have to understand that nothing in this world will be able to sever the friendship existing between Germany and Russia."

OPIUM ON THE CORNER: The following classified advertisement appeared in the *New Masses* for July 8: "House—3 yrs. old, 6 rooms, 2 porches, finished basement, garage, 40 by 100, all modern equipment, 1 block from Catholic church, parochial school, all transportation."

GENEROSO POPE, pro-fascist publisher, was scheduled to read a speech at a Marconi memorial dinner last week. He dropped the prepared version, however, for whoever wrote it had inserted criticism of Italy and the Axis.

TO HEAL THE SPLIT in the American Newspaper Guild, administration leaders have offered to withdraw some of their candidates in favor of those of the opposition group. The most probable reason for the offer is that the administration, once militantly isolationist, is now strongly interventionist and wishes to work closely with the large number in the opposition who have supported aid to Britain since the outbreak of war. Opposition leaders who have been informed of the offer have unanimously rejected it, preferring to fight the election on the issue of continuing Communist control of the union.

AMONG THOSE ARRESTED in Cuba's recent housecleaning of Phalangists was Genaro Riestra, formerly the Spanish consul general in Havana. Riestra was charged with having in his possession fifty-two boxes containing 110,000 Phalangist medals.

THE CHICAGO PUBLIC LIBRARY last month conducted a campaign to obtain gifts of books for soldiers in the Sixth Corps Area and for sailors of the Ninth Naval District. When the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee was solicited, it responded with an offer to supply several copies of "The Story of Civil Liberties in America." Major C. C. Gregg, however, declined the gift, writing to the executive secretary of the committee as follows: "The patriotic spirit which prompted your generous offer is greatly appreciated, but there is no demand for books of this type in army libraries. For this reason your offer is not accepted, and sample copy of the book has been returned under separate cover this date." Major Gregg added that he could not speak for the navy.

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind —either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Native at Large

BY JONATHAN DANIELS

Confusion on the Potomac

THE strangest spectacle I meet on the trains these days is that of people going to Washington patriotic and coming away puzzled. Somehow the capital, where unity is designed, is for most visitors—and everybody seems to have to visit it now—the place where bewilderment is discovered. I think I know at least one reason why. Washington is the place on the Potomac where the idea seems to have grown that big government necessarily means the crowding of government in one place at almost the greatest possible distance from the fields and wood lots and towns and homes of America.

Washington is aware of its own bigness, its own bulging. Visitors discuss the possibility of finding a bed. Leon Henderson recently told Congress that rents are higher there than in any other large city in the country. Since the census of 1940, made only a little over a year ago, the population has run up from 663,000 to close to a million. The magnificent office buildings which Hoover began and Roosevelt continued are packed to their bronze doors with clerks and administrators, coordinators and stenographers. Outside them the governmen pays $4,000,000 a year in rent for other office space and is pushing people out of apartment houses in order to rent more. The War Department is planning a building that will provide working space under one roof for 40,000 people. The District of Columbia has overflowed into Maryland and Virginia.

Only a few people seem interested in the possibility that big government, as it governs the details of the lives of more people in more places in a big land, might mean not more centralization in one city but less. Few seem interested in the fact that the same technical factors of long rails, long wires, long air lanes which made one big government essential, make possible also the decentralization of that same big government: Instead, every day Washington becomes the more crowded destination of more people, and in a wide country the government remains close to one coast, a templed target for the first bombers.

Defense now seems to be outrunning even the possibility of more crowding. That is for me the most splendid sign in the sky. Nothing else promises so much for escape from the present crowded confusion on the Potomac. Before defense, of course, there were many field offices, and a multitude of fields agents rode the railroads and the air lanes and the roads. Most departments had state and regional offices, some of them large ones. But now there actually is not space for agencies in Washington. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Board are moving to New York. The Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior has been shifted to Salt Lake City. The process, I think, could be carried a long way without damage to government.

I know the great difficulties in dispersal. Policy makers must be close to the White House. Maybe patronage dispensers have to be close to Congress. But it is as easy to telephone from Washington to Des Moines as it is from G Street to Constitution Avenue. It doesn't take much more time to fly to Philadelphia than it does to cross Washington at some hours of its traffic. The huge concentration of army and navy officials in Washington may serve the unified command, but the vast halls of agriculture are a long way from the grass roots. The Interior Department, now to some extent shifting its agencies, is not in the interior but on the rim of the country.

I'm not arguing against big government. Its necessity was obvious in an America in which irresponsible private powers had grown so big. But the confusion in Washington now—and even the people who make it feel it—is not merely the result of the defense rush. It is part of the remoteness of government in a place where unread reports from the field are filed by the bale, where America is a matter of neat charts on which departments are little squares dealing with items that are only remotely people. It is part of a country run by statistics which not even magnificent Presidential oratory brings wholly to life.

Government experts can probably point out how insane it would be to put the government of the country in the country, leaving only the essential centralized agencies located in the capital city. But big government could surely be broken up into pieces in cities and towns closer to the people of America. And I have a feeling that if the defense crowding could run more and more agencies out of the megalomania of Washington, not only might defense be served, but in more than military ways democratic government in America might be made more sensible and secure.

I never saw Babel but I've been to Washington. A lot of us now ride out of it with a feeling that we are glad to get back to a lucid America from a capital where the confusion is not limited to tongues.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Public Poem

BY GEORGE BARKER

Poems come down, shouting, down
Out of the twelvemonth silence I
Turn circles in: so long, so long,
I sucked the stone of Moses dry
Without a word of praise. Time
Showing its ragged tongues of wrong
Went weeping silently across
The vision I have of what is.
Distracted in its miseries
Like the homeless on the roads
Of the overwhelmed map, face after face,
Hiding their degradation in
The hands of panic, under loads
Of violently uprooted peace and place,
Like them Time moved across my vision
Appealing with an inflamed gaze
For the redeeming reason.
And, dumbstruck as a photographer when
The unbelievable creature of a fable
Stares at him with incurious eyes,
I saw the women and men
Of a fifth of the inhabitable
World gaze across the latitude
Of their glittering disasters, than
O the Atlantic vaster, gaze toward
The Indian summer of Gratitude,
Platitude, and Reward:—
Peace and America. What is eloquent,
If anything praises anything, their living,
Their dying, their dying, their dying,
Their continual death, continual reviving,
More than poems? Poems have praising
No less than the light has shining
Or the Caesar has killing: praise is element
The poem grows in: therefore the
Poet can speak of unmentionable catastrophe
Where the Public Orator or President
Is and must remain silent.
But I can praise the suffering of those
Ordinary people in commonplace occupations
Whose lives, as suddenly as railway stations,
Have given importance to unimportant nations,
And dignity to the ridiculous pose
Of dictatorial History. I can honor
Their doctored animosity against
Those whom they do not hate, because
In animosity action is condensed,
And action exonerates its own cause.
I can honor their doctrinal intolerance
Because weeping is the anthem of France;
And I can honor their constant faith
In the physical efficiency of death,
That star-struck superstition that the church
Established the sepulchers of the saints beneath.
I can honor most of all their living,
Their dying, their dying, their dying,
Everyone, everyone, everyone,
For nothing but the phony vocabulary
Of politicians, or the simple perfection
Of being themselves: accepting the ghost
In the house of existence, the poison berry
In the big bowl of cherries. But most
I honor them for the lives they bury
In the huge tomb of their beliefs
Whose caryatids of Christ and Mary
Sag at the knees but wear their grief
So beautifully and so naturally.

Therefore, because he honors them,
The poet can praise them in poems;
Celebrating the simple apothegm,
The immoral means and moral aims,
The love parental to all crimes.
For the ax recants to the branch, the hand
Absolves the guilty sword:
The poem expiates its words
As long as its words stand.
The kiss of the epithet as it fits the object
Is nuptials of the Truth. And this
Elevates from the merely abject
Poems where too much personal passion is.

The bleeding arrow in the sparrow's breast
Weeps its remission. Thus I now bleed
At the Wailing Wall of the dispossessed,
The distressed and the superseded;
But their tears, not our poems, forgive the deeds
That caused them. The scold's bridle,
The soul's chastity belt may be removed
From the Museum Gallery where they were idle,
But I speak with a better tongue:
And when the sad ones reach their bridal bed
God in the worm will see they are not unloved.

And in the Winter Gardens the Norwegian
Retains his kingdom; the Finn
Still dominates the athletic region;
And in his amorous bed the Corinthian boy
Is autonomous still.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Primer for Appeasers

YOU CAN'T DO BUSINESS WITH HITLER. By Douglas Miller. Little, Brown and Company. $1.50.

THIS book has already climbed high into the best-seller list. That is bad news for Herr Hitler, for the more Americans who read this revealing account of what Nazism really means, the more likely this country is to pursue the kind of realistic policy which eventually will spell his doom.

The facts which Mr. Miller presents are not, for the most part, exactly news. Any diligent reader of the New York *Times* over the past eight years should be familiar with them. But in this book they are organized lucidly, pointed up sharply with anecdotes from the author's personal experience, and subjected to a common-sense analysis. On the question of American business relations with Nazi Germany Mr. Miller speaks with unusual authority since from 1924 to 1939 he was at the American embassy in Berlin, first as trade commissioner and then as commercial attaché. Thus he was an eyewitness to the rise of Hitler to power and for the six years following was in a strategic position to study the development of Nazi economics.

Although Mr. Miller's approach to his subject is an economic one, he knows, and impresses on his readers, that the essential key to the understanding of Nazi Germany is grasp of the fact that its economic policies are always subordinate to its politics. As he says:

> For the Nazis it was not merely a case of "trade follows the flag." In their highly organized system trade, military alignments, use of German officers for training troops, the establishment of Nazi radio stations and newspaper chains, airlines, shipping, German schools, exchanges of students and professors, all marched together, each an element in the Nazi drive. Such a movement illustrates dramatically what is meant by the word *totalitarian.*

American business men who think of trade in old-fashioned terms as a mutually advantageous exchange of goods have already suffered from Nazi methods of squeeze. Even when they have attempted to accommodate themselves to Nazi barter methods they have found it impossible to get a square deal. Mr. Miller tells how the American walnut growers tried to do barter business in Germany. They found that in order to dispose of $100,000 worth of walnuts they would have to buy $300,000 worth of burlap bags and barbed wire and seek to recoup their outlay by reselling these articles in the United States.

While Germany was still at peace, while the Nazis were still encouraging American isolation by being fairly solicitous to American feelings, trade on any normal basis was impossible. Yet some politicians and business men talk today as if it would be perfectly feasible to do business with Hitler if he wins the war and grabs the resources of three continents for use as politico-military weapons. In that event, Mr. Miller foresees that the Germans will turn to Latin America and make apparently generous offers to buy its surplus food and raw materials. But what, it may be asked, will they use for money? Mr. Miller suggests that the answer to that question is *arms*. Germany, he points out, will have an expanded arms capacity, and its war equipment, "wearing the blue ribbon of victory," will be offered at attractive prices in enormous quantities. If one Latin American country starts buying German arms, its neighbors will feel impelled to do the same. Nazi agents will then intensify their present efforts to stir up strife so as to encourage the demand for weapons. Needless to say, the outbreak of a few civil or external wars would seriously endanger the defense of this hemisphere.

Reading this book, one finds it hard to resist its realistic conclusion that this war will be ended by either a German or an American settlement. If the former, it can be taken for granted that the interests of this country will be totally disregarded. If Hitler is defeated, America will certainly play a decisive part in the victory. But a satisfactory peace will be unattainable unless America is willing to accept the responsibility of leadership in promoting international cooperation. It will be costly in money and effort, but as Mr. Miller says, we have the money and we would enjoy making the effort. More difficult would be "the sacrifice of some of our dearest prejudices and opinions." Few honest readers of this book will hesitate to find even such a sacrifice amply justified by the hideous alternative.

KEITH HUTCHISON

America South

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HISPANIC AMERICA. By A. Curtis Wilgus. Farrar and Rinehart. $6.50.

GOOD NEIGHBORS. By Hubert Herring. Yale University Press. $3.

CHILE, LAND OF PROGRESS. By Earl P. Hanson. Reynal and Hitchcock. $1.75.

COLOMBIA. By Kathleen Romoli. Doubleday, Doran and Company. $3.50.

THE Latin American attitude toward the United States, Great Britain, and the Axis powers, toward fifth columns, democracy, fascism, and the like, is conditioned by the historical development of Latin American political institutions. Democracy does not naturally exist in countries with a submerged Indian population—not an annihilated one as in this country. Even genuine liberalism tends to have a patriarchal, not to say bureaucratic character. Wherever an illiterate mass has virtually no suffrage, the emphasis will tend to be on legislation rather than on the carrying out of reforms. In countries which not so long ago freed themselves from the Spanish Empire and which then experienced the benevolence of the dollar, there will often be found ideas of sovereignty that seem exaggerated to a North American in search of collaboration. And in any case there is an almost insoluble economic problem to be confronted. The mess that official propaganda agencies have made of their wooing of South America so far might be corrected with a little more knowledge of Latin American development. And so might certain blithe criticism, one may add.

An excellent way of plunging into any subject is first to read a sound orthodox treatise of acknowledged scholarship and then to reach out to less orthodox works. In the case of South America lusty readers of sound constitution could not do better than tackle Professor Wilgus's immense volume. From the standpoint of orthodox scholarship "The Development of Hispanic America" is the definitive volume. Since the word definitive is about the strongest that can be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

used of a work of this kind, the reviewer is compelled to add that he is not a specialist in South American history, in which, nevertheless, he has read considerably. Professor Wilgus will not be read for his imaginative syntheses or his profound penetration, much less for his style. He is no Cunninghame Graham, no Humboldt, or Las Casas, or Bernal Diaz, but a thorough consulter of the documents in the case. One will open his book confident that upon almost every important point it will direct the reader to the core and essence of the matter.

Mr. Herring's book is not a librarian's or a research student's companion. One of the features of Mr. Herring's method is to sum up the qualities of a statesman in a judiciously balanced sentence. Doing the same with his book, one could say that it is alert, that it combines the usually discordant values of urbanity and candor, that it is well informed and not merely a compendium of the things that are said in "well-informed" circles, and that its judgments on the Latin American attitude toward the United States are those of a generous liberal who respects his own country. Mr. Herring knows what he is talking about far too well to be deceived by propagandists of any sort. He knows how much and how little democracy there is in South America and what is rarer, how much and how little dictatorship there is. Advocates of sweeping theories will find little encouragement in this volume.

Mr. Herring's book is the work of a keen mind of considerable sophistication. Mr. Hanson's "Chile, Land of Progress" is the work of an enthusiast. The liveliness of the author's admiration for Chile has caused him to write a very readable little book which with no serious pretensions is none the less useful as introduction to its subject. One fears that the author's respect for Chilean liberalism is a little too exuberant. And one would have liked a little less landscape and fiesta and rather more sober evaluation of economic and political difficulties. Anyway, Mr. Hanson would have his tourists join up on the side of the angels.

Kathleen Romoli's "Colombia" is frankly a travel book, a volume of personal impressions of people and countryside, with plentiful discursive references to folklore and the more anecdotal side of history. For anyone of non-political bent about to pay a short visit to the country, the book would be very serviceable. One feels a country of definite character in its pages. It gave me a modest pleasure, comparable, say, to that given by the music of Grieg. RALPH BATES

Building as Action

ARCHITECTURE THROUGH THE AGES. By Talbot Hamlin. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $6.

IT IS hard to believe, but we receive a first-rate one-volume history of architecture written by a qualified American scholar only about once in a generation. The reasons are numerous, some of them technical; but the fact remains that previous to Talbot Hamlin's recently published book, "Architecture Through the Ages," the last comparable volume in the field was Kimball and Edgell's "A History of Architecture," published in 1917.

In the interim have come many shifts in the architectural climate, and apart from its own personal quality the new book serves to reflect them. For one thing, the general reader is expected to have a wider horizon. The architecture of pre-Columbian America, of Islam, of Eastern Asia, has been brought, if not close, at least into decent visibility. Primitive architecture is treated, in keeping with present-day attitudes, not as mere preparation for further progress but as part of a terrain in which some of the highest peaks of achievement are immemorial. Indeed, in his opening sentence the author extends the view to embrace more even than primitive art, and describes man as one among many organisms whose sharing of the building instinct makes them kin.

This view of building itself as a mode of action, a process, an instrumentality, dependent on varying technical and material resources and serving many kinds of human purpose and many ways of life, is given the emphasis in the book that was once reserved for formal definitions dealing with styles and grammars and vocabularies of design. Architecture is not a different, or a higher, but a more perceptive kind of building. The constant interest in what people built *for* gives to Professor Hamlin's book that sense of motivation which merely classifying textbooks never have and which first-rate histories are made of. And yet, since he is one of the most self-effacing as well as one of the most scholarly of our critics, Professor Hamlin tells his far-ranging story with a remarkable absence of theory-grinding or thesis-proving.

The motives he recognizes are on many different planes and are not reduced to formula. For example, the manner in which Roman building methods actually spread northward is explained through the operations of common sense; what the "barbarians" imitated and carried over was of course not what *we* think of as Roman architecture—the grand monuments of the distant capital that these people had never seen —but the practical, negotiable structures of the provincial military camps that were visited daily. Or, again, a shift may come through the mere satiation of some taste, as is shown in the telling comparison between the grand ceremonious chamber of Louis XIV at the daily *levée du roi* and later the richly intimate bedroom in a private villa secured for the companionship of a night by Casanova. The pomp of Versailles had simply become insufferable in its beating publicity; and, besides, there were so few contrivances for human amenity that the vast halls under their chandeliers smelled like a sewer; there had come into the courtier's life a pressing need for privacy, intimacy, conversation, and intrigue that was mirrored in the smaller, more convenient residences, not to mention the Petit Trianons and the Amalienburgs, of the new age.

The dominant urge which, in the author's mind, holds all these varied endeavors together as "architecture" is the desire for beauty, "some sort of 'form,' some kind of attractive or decent consistency." Once this harmony is achieved, so the book implies, it lives on independently of its original source or purpose, and can be admired like a beautiful woman or a flower, regardless of circumstances. What lifts this conception above the old "art for art's sake" is the author's attention to social living as the source of the content and meaning within the form; yet he tends to accept, as a gift of beauty, manifestations that others denounce as scintillating harlotry; for example, he congratulates the inhabitant of Rome be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cause, although "he might sleep in a slum five flights up, [yet] almost all of his leisure hours could be spent, if he wished, in public places of a beauty, variety, and grandeur that few other civilizations have ever equaled."

Professor Hamlin is free of those aggressive partisanships of taste that vitiate histories of art. He is an exception among our historians in being avidly interested in fresh creation and new ideas under way. If he makes mistakes, they are on the side of kindness. In temperament he is perhaps at his best in elucidating trends of a basically classical character.

War and emergency will distract from the reception that would normally be accorded to so fine a volume on the history of architecture as an art. Yet many will find it restorative of sanity to snatch time from the battle and be led through this one area of human endeavor in which the aim is not only total usefulness but, above that, total concord.

DOUGLAS HASKELL

Prospero Among Poets

COLLECTED POEMS. By Walter de la Mare. Henry Holt and Company. $3.75.

LIKE the one-man show of a painter who has achieved his full stature, a book of collected poems offers a comprehensive view of the writer's range and development. To press the analogy a little farther, one might say that Walter de la Mare's collection is not, as a show of Picasso's would be, or, to come nearer home, the collected poems of Yeats, representative of various periods. It is not blue in one section and rose in another; the contours are not now all angles and next all curves; the voice is not first languid and then harsh. Here are the contents of half a dozen volumes of his verse, the work of some thirty-five years, but the only difference between the earliest poems and the more recent ones is a slight gain in subtlety of thought and technique. As he never strays from traditional forms, so too De la Mare sustains the tone of his verse, tender, wistful, and ever charged with a sense of mystery. Not all the poems are equally interesting, and this thick volume is not to be read through without some distress at the poet's steady preoccupation with a few themes handled in accustomed ways. But De la Mare is so sensitive a craftsman, however old-fashioned, and is, moreover, so susceptible to the more delicate shades of perception and feeling, that to dip into his pages is to know renewed delight.

Some of the most familiar lyrics, such as Arabia, The Listeners, Miss Loo, The Little Salamander, remain among the most enchanting. Indeed, enchantment is the word that most happily describes his finest verse. Here is a poet literally haunted—by the ghost of his childhood, by the *genius loci* that presides over garden, grove, and stream, by memory and apprehension. He is exquisitely alive to the presence of the past, the peculiar quality of a given scene, the reality informing myth and legend, the sense of selfhood. Under his spell such abstractions as time and death and beauty become almost palpable. He is not so profound a mystic as Rilke, nor has he mastered the grimmer aspects of that poet's experience, but his poems have something of the same quality of penetration and trembling awareness.

His chief means of conveying his thought, if such shy intimations may be so called, is his felicitous fingering and graceful melody. No poet of our time comes so close to the music of Mozart as De la Mare. There is the same apparent simplicity and careful structure, the same lightness of touch if not quite that depth of serenity. These lyrics remind one that the dance is a first source of poetry. It is not De la Mare's imagery but his singing syllables, his mastery of metric, his clever manipulation of consonants and vowels, that catches the ear and bemuses the heart. Consider the familiar but enduringly lovely Epitaph:

> Here lies a most beautiful lady,
> Light of step and heart was she;
> I think she was the most beautiful lady
> That ever was in the West Country.
>
> But beauty vanishes, beauty passes;
> However rare—rare it be;
> And when I crumble, who will remember
> This lady of the West Country?

The fellow-craftsman will take pleasure in analyzing the peculiar skill with which this seemingly slight thing is managed. The common reader will rejoice in its sheer magic. One returns repeatedly to the charm of All That's Past, with those haunting opening lines:

> Very old are the woods;
> And the boughs that break
> Out of the brier's broughs,
> When March winds wake,
> So old with their beauty are—
> Oh, no man knows
> Through what wild centuries
> Roves back the rose.

Nor can one forget the sad music of the final stanza of Fare Well:

> Look thy last on all things lovely,
> Every hour. Let no night
> Seal thy sense in deathly slumber
> Till to delight
> Thou have paid thy utmost blessing;
> Since that all things thou wouldst praise
> Beauty took from those who loved them
> In other days.

Now and again the poet surprises one with a touch of dry humor, as when he sketches a character like Old Susan, engrossed in her romance, or tells an anecdote in verse, like that of the child who weeps over the shot hare and then, distracted from pity by a martial parade, comes back to the kitchen to ask: "Please, may I go and see it skinned?" But such entertainment is rare, and yet rarer De la Mare's recognition of the tragedies common to our urban and industrial civilization. There is at least one sardonic war poem here, but in the main he deals in his own charming fashion with such themes as Marvell or Herrick might have played variations upon. He differs from them in being more conscious of the mystery that like a shoreless sea reaches far beyond the horizons of that island which is the world we know. Indeed, he dwells on this island like another Prospero, conjuring up visions as real as the gross world of common sense, commanding Ariel, and filling the ears of Caliban himself with sounds and sweet airs that give delight and hurt not. Yet even like Prospero, this serene magician touches us because he knows mortal sorrows.

BABETTE DEUTSCH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trade-Union Statesmanship

UNION POLICIES AND INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT. By Sumner H. Schlichter. Brookings Institution. $3.50.

AT A dinner of some 600 business executives held last spring in Pittsburgh, one of the speakers was Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O. Mr. Murray was the only speaker whom the entire assembly, at the conclusion of his speech, rose to its feet to applaud. The next day and for some time afterward the speech was the subject of conversation in many spacious offices and exclusive business men's clubs. It still startles a large section of our business community to discover that labor organizations and their leaders have intelligent and constructive ideas to contribute. These persons would do well to read Professor Slichter's book. They will find that over a period of many years established trade unions have been laboriously working out rules and procedures for collective bargaining which in their aggregate represent a system of "industrial jurisprudence."

This study is the most complete compilation of American trade-union practices which has so far appeared, comparable only to the study of British trade-union practices by the Webbs. It is designed primarily as a textbook and reference work and is not easy reading, but it is written in a style much more alive than that of most books in this category. Out of the innumerable details relating to shop rules, control over apprenticeship, hiring, layoffs, seniority, work distribution, the many ways of determining wage rates, and policies concerning the introduction of new and speedier devices, emerges an evolutionary pattern as complex and exciting as the struggle for biological survival. This development comes to the fore after the fight for union recognition has been won. The struggle is then not only against employers but against the conditions inherent in a competitive economy moving swiftly toward monopoly, conditions complicated by the recurring tide of widespread unemployment. Immediate expedience is in perpetual conflict with long-range objectives, and the heavy toll exacted by technological advance and periodic depression is an ever-present source of friction in the formation of union policy. The trend has been away from rather than toward emphasis on class lines. This is not surprising, for trade unions are essentially a part of the capitalist system, and while they are engaged in a constant tug of war with employers to obtain concessions, a great deal of trade-union effort and strategy has been directed toward keeping the smaller and less efficient enterprises from being swallowed up by the larger ones. It may surprise Thurman Arnold to find that unions have done a great deal more to check combinations in restraint of trade than all the anti-monopoly suits waged or threatened since the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890.

Where union cooperation has been accepted, it has helped both industry and labor. Unfortunately, it has been accepted only in sick industries, such as coal, railroads, clothing, and textiles, and even in these only by the most progressive or the most depressed employers. In the majority of cases of union-management cooperation, the initiative has come from the union. Employers, according to Professor Slichter, have not encouraged cooperative action, primarily because they

Two Books For Every Believer-In-Democracy:

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?
By Charles E. Merriam

Here is a working definition of democracy, and a spirited defense of democratic ideals that will bolster the faith of every American. Is democracy *really* slow to make decisions? Is it *really* inefficient? How was the "democracies always become dictatorships in time of war" accusation answered by no less a figure than Lincoln? A leading political scientist and author now replies, sanely and convincingly, to the arguments of those who are pessimistic about the future of American democracy. $1.00.

DEMOCRACY IN AMERICAN LIFE
By Avery Craven

Today we are again faced with the decision of finding a *new meaning* for our concept of democracy. Here is a clear and vigorous exposition of what democracy has meant to us before in our history: pioneer days, the early years of the Constitution, the Civil War, the era of expansion. Here, too, is what democracy meant to the founding fathers — and how Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Bryan each used democracy in his own way — shedding important light on the kind of democracy *we* must demand from our leaders in this hour's crisis. $1.00.

1891 · 1941 50 YEARS OF PUBLISHING

Walgreen Foundation Lectures for the Study of American Institutions

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

● EVERY CRITIC SAYS: "READ IT!"
The ONLY book that tells what is going on in Latin America today —and what we can do about it

GOOD NEIGHBORS
By HUBERT HERRING

Timely information on Argentina, Brazil, Chile and 17 other Latin-American countries.

CAN HITLER WIN THEM?

$3.00
YALE

"A 'must' for those who wish to think intelligently about pan-American politics."
—CHRISTOPHER MORLEY

"Splendid . . . frank . . . revealing . . . concise and remarkably accurate."
—N. Y. TIMES BOOK REVIEW

"Tells us just what these good neighbors to the south are about."
—N. Y. WORLD TELEGRAM

"Shrewd and informative."
—N. Y. HERALD TRIBUNE "BOOKS".

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been "jealous of their ancient prerogatives." They have been "more interested in keeping unions in their place than in accepting their help." This is a policy of waste. The utilization of labor's familiarity with production problems would react to the benefit of workers, management, and society as a whole. The cooperation, however, must be genuine, with both parties having an equal voice.

It is at this point that Professor Slichter's thesis reveals a cardinal weakness. For he invites labor to cooperate in a preconceived plan. Without specific reference, it is obviously the Brookings plan for industrial self-discipline in limiting per-unit profit, for the sake of greater volume, through control of the price mechanism, which in the end would leave the share going to savings undisturbed. No one disputes the urgent need of increased production, but there is too much evidence for comfort that lowered costs do not automatically result in lower prices and consequent increased demand, followed by increased production. There is little reason to believe that the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, or the various industry institutes will be more successful in regulating a monopolistic economy than Adam Smith's natural law has been. Union-management cooperation is desirable, and labor is eager to take part in it, but labor's status must be that of an equal partner, not that of a "company union" which at the push of a button says yes. To be effective any joint effort by labor and industry must embrace not merely the execution of a ready-made plan but the working out of that plan, on which there must be full agreement.

ROSE M. STEIN

To keep abreast of HISTORY in the MAKING

FILL OUT AND MAIL THIS

Order Form

THE NATION • 55 FIFTH AVE. • NEW YORK

In order for me to keep abreast of history in the making, please enter my subscription to *The Nation* for the period indicated below. I inclose $.....

☐ One Year $5

☐ Two Years $8

☐ Three Years $11

Special Introductory Offer

☐ 13 Weeks $1

Name.....

Address.....

.....

8-9-41

Foreign and Canadian postage $1 a year

Technology and Sea Power

SEA POWER IN THE MACHINE AGE. By Bernard Brodie. Princeton University Press. $3.75.

IN THIS war, just as in the last great conflict, the average onlooker has become conscious of the immense role which science, technology, and individual inventiveness are called upon to play. It is a war of instruments and machines as well as of men, and there is scarcely one of us but believes that the fate of England and its allies depends upon their ability not only to outfight the forces of the Axis but to out-produce and out-invent its engineers and technicians. Yet despite our interest in these matters, there have been strangely few efforts to write the history of military technology, especially for modern warfare; and although no competent military history ever leaves wholly out of account the influence of new weapons and improved matériel, no competent general study of the influence of technical progress on the art of war has made its appearance. Nor can such a work be written until much spade work has been done and innumerable partial studies have been completed. Mr. Brodie's "Sea Power in the Machine Age," though rather ambitious in scope, is the sort of partial study that is needed. Mr. Brodie has given a clearly written and non-technical account of the great inventions which during the last century and a half have shaped the modern naval establishments and influenced the way they are employed.

The deficiencies of Mr. Brodie's book are inherent in the complexity of the problem he has undertaken to treat. There are too many questions that need to be answered, and though Mr. Brodie has limited himself to naval problems, and therein has confined himself to certain revolutionary inventions, he has tried to answer more of these basic questions than the scope of his work readily permits. Inevitably some questions are answered better than others.

The author has confined his attention to a half-dozen major developments: the introduction of steam propulsion, where he discusses the successive adoption of the side-wheel steamer, of screw-propelled vessels, and of oil as a naval fuel; the adoption of the iron hull, as distinguished from the building of ironclad vessels; the development of armor and great ordnance; the perfection of undersea warfare, with the torpedo, the mine, and the submarine; and finally the development of the naval air arm. As he himself recognizes, this selection leaves out of account a host of minor inventions and improvements that have influenced warfare at sea. There is little to criticize, however, about Mr. Brodie's choice, although one may doubt the wisdom of excluding all discussion of telegraphic communication on the ground that cable and wireless are not primarily naval inventions. Neither, for that matter, are aircraft and heavy ordnance, to which he devotes so much space.

Mr. Brodie treats each invention in a separate section, sketches its early development, describes the difficulties attending its adoption, and carries the story of its use—in a manner calculated to attract the general reader and to dismay the conservative historian—through the events of the present conflict. In each case the author is chiefly at pains to assess the influence of each invention upon naval tactics and strategy and to inquire how these new conditions have altered the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

balance of power between states. His general conclusion is that, taken all together, the inventions that he discusses have resulted in a greater dependence of the battle fleet upon its base, a sharp narrowing of its range of action, and a profound change in the meaning of blockade. Although Mr. Brodie gives some attention to all the great navies of the world—discussing, for example, how French efforts to checkmate English naval supremacy in the nineteenth century led to the adoption by the French of a radical policy of technical innovation—his principal questions were bound to be: How did Great Britain react to the series of naval inventions that were certain to influence its position at sea? How, in reality, did this technological advance affect its ability to maintain maritime supremacy? In reply to the first question Mr. Brodie has shown that England pursued a cautious, but by no means a conservative, policy in the adoption of new inventions and improvements, and in so doing was inclined to be unduly pessimistic as to the effect that each advance might have on its mastery of the sea. As it turned out, England benefited, in the large, by the great revolution which made naval resources depend primarily upon a highly developed industrial plant and upon ready resources of iron and coal, and which freed it from the perennial problem of naval supplies which had troubled it since the days of Samuel Pepys. Even the tactical changes that accompanied the introduction of steam did not imperil the security of its island; and the succession of invasion panics which beset the English in the middle of the nineteenth century—Mr. Brodie describes them with spirit and in some detail—were soon proved to be without foundation.

HENRY GUERLAC

PUBLISHED THIS WEEK

BARRINGTON TOWN-WARMING. Volume III. Containing Addresses Delivered at Barrington Town-Warming Meetings. Barrington, Ill. $1.

LOOK AT ALL THOSE ROSES. By Elizabeth Bowen. Knopf. $2.50.

ANGLO-AMERICAN UNION. Joseph Galloway's Plans to Preserve the British Empire 1774-1788. By Julian P. Boyd. University of Pennsylvania Press. $2.

NO LIFE FOR A LADY. By Agnes Morley Cleaveland. Houghton Mifflin. $3.

LOOKING FOR TROUBLE. By Virginia Cowles. Harper. $3.50.

HEARING MUSIC. The Art of *Active* Listening. By Theodore M. Finney. Harcourt, Brace. $3.50.

LOW ON THE WAR. A Cartoon Commentary of the Years 1939-41. By David Low. Simon and Schuster. $2.

IN THE MILL. By John Masefield. Macmillan. $2.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY? By Charles E. Merriam. University of Chicago Press. $1.

A SUITE FOR FRANCE. By Clark Mills. Prairie City, Illinois: Press of James A. Decker.

THE PENGUIN HANSARD. Vol. III. Britain Gathers Strength. Penguin Books. 25 cents.

THE DON FLOWS HOME TO THE SEA. By Mikhail Sholokhov. Knopf. $3.50.

READING POEMS. An Introduction to Critical Study. By Wright Thomas and Stuart Gerry Brown. Oxford University Press. $2.75.

GIVE SANCTUARY TO THESE

The Battle-Ground Is Their Play-Yard

The following is a letter we have just received from Eric G. Muggeridge, our executive secretary, now in England:

"Dear Friends:

"Tubes and shelters are just as crowded with families taking up bunk and platform sleeping, now every night, just as they were during the blitz. We have lately admitted many children to our sanctuaries whose mothers have had complete breakdowns. Present problems are tremendous, let alone those which follow another series of raids . . . which may return any night.

"Each time we visit the tube-dwellers, our hearts go out to them. The children are pale and thin. They have slept underground for so long. During the day they play amidst debris and rubble—a battle-ground for a play-yard.

"I wish you could hear the children when they arrive in the country. 'They don't come here do they?' one little one will ask. 'I hope you have shelters to sleep in anyway,' says another, 'because you never can tell.' After a few days they talk of nothing but the fields and the loveliness of it all. 'Can my brother come and all my friends too?' So I ask it of you, may brothers, sisters and little friends come to the countryside too? Will you help please?

"(signed) Eric G. Muggeridge."

The Foster Parents Plan for War Children maintains and operates "sanctuaries" in safe pastoral regions all over England, for children of all nationalities made homeless by bombardments. Funds are needed for food, clothing and the many other requirements to make life comfortable for children separated from their parents as a result of the war.

The Foster Parents' Plan for War Children does not do mass relief. The aim of the Plan is to give to children beside shelter, food and clothing, a homelike atmosphere and loving care. All monies are cabled through the Chase National Bank of New York to our account in London and pass through the hands of no other committee. No amount is too small. Will you help, please?

Edna Blue—Executive Chairman, American Committee.
J. B. Priestley—Chairman, British Committee.

Partial Lists of Co-operating Organizations and Sponsors

Eleanor Roosevelt	**Mrs. J. B. Priestley**	**Vernon Bartlett, M. P.**
Freda Kirchwey	**London County Council**	**Lady Allen**
Russell Maguire	**British Women's Volunteers**	**Earl of Listowel**
Clifton Fadiman	**Hampstead Borough Council**	**Viscount Cecil of Chelwood**

FOSTER PARENTS' PLAN FOR WAR CHILDREN, INC.
55 West 42nd Street, New York City LOngacre 5-1096

A. I wish to become a Foster Parent of a War Child for one year. If possible, sex ..... I will pay $15.00 a month for one year. Payments will be made quarterly ..... yearly ..... monthly ..... I enclose herewith my first payment $.....

B. I cannot "adopt" a child but I would like to help a child by contributing $.....

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State..... Date.....

Registered with U. S. State Dept. No. 57. Contributions are deductible from Income Tax

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN BRIEF

MEN WORKING. By John Faulkner. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.50.

Mr. Faulkner's story is in the rising tide of the American novel of defeated lives. The Taylors of Mississippi, who leave the farm for the WPA, are born to misery. With generations of resignation as their birthright, they are unaware of tragedy as they drift toward destruction. The achievement of the book is the author's complete lack of condescension toward his characters. Their moving story is simply and amusingly told, without diagnosis or prognosis, in the terms of their own bewildered lives.

THE SENTIMENTAL NOVEL IN AMERICA, 1789-1860. By Herbert Ross Brown. Duke University. $3.

This book, which won the Duke University Press centennial prize contest, is one of those admittedly scholarly ransackings of forgotten lore which professors describe as "entertaining." The original materials might seem entertaining in an essay of medium length, but not in a full-length "study" where every point is "proved" with chapter and verse.

DRUMS AND SHADOWS. Survival Studies Among the Georgia Coastal Negroes. By the Savannah Unit, Georgia Writers' Project. Foreword by Guy B. Johnson. Photographs by Muriel and Malcolm Bell, Jr. University of Georgia Press. $3.

For various reasons African survivals are especially clear in the folklore of the Georgia Negroes. This careful and scientific survey, with an appendix of cross-references to the works of African anthropologists, is valuable source material for the sociologist. It is also interesting reading for its own sake, though the interest is diminished by repetition. The book is an exceptionally beautiful example of modern printing and binding.

THE DEFLATION OF AMERICAN IDEALS. By Edgar Kemler. American Council on Public Affairs. $2.50.

The three main sections of this rather original book, described as "An Ethical Guide for New Dealers," deal with deflation in moral content, economic policy, and foreign policy. The author's belief is that we have a great advantage over the generation which undertook to make the world safe for democracy in that New Deal reform and New Deal foreign policy, in a pretty thoroughly debunked world, rest their case "not . . . on man's concern for his moral virtue, but on the selfish interests of millions of organized workers and less organized farmers and consumers." We thus have a good chance of avoiding the emotional reaction which led us back to "normalcy" and isolation.

RECORDS

THE value of the phonograph record in preserving for all time the performances of great artists which otherwise would be lost is something the companies themselves have talked about on occasion. But on the one hand the great Cortot-Thibaud-Casals performance of Schubert's Trio Op. 99 that was in the Victor catalogue a couple of years ago is no longer there now. And on the other hand no recordings were made of Schnabel's performances of Mozart's Piano Concertos K. 466, 467, 482, and 488 with the New Friends of Music Orchestra in April, 1940, though these performances were incomparable not only in the way the piano parts were done but in the way the entire works were done—in the way the orchestral parts were integrated in style, in phrasing with the piano parts. If one had had to decide in what tonal embodiments the four concertos should be given permanent life on records, these performances would have been the ones chosen, without question. Yet they were not recorded.

It is not sufficient reason that Victor already had recordings of the works in its catalogue—that it already had two of K. 466, in fact. For these two were an instance of the fact that Victor does duplicate; and now, with those two unsatisfactory recordings of K. 466 in its catalogue, it does, after all, give us a third which is no better, made by Iturbi with the Rochester Philharmonic (Set 794, $4.50). Iturbi's way of playing Mozart is one that I dislike because of its effect on the music, or the effect it gives to the music. If I go so far as to say Iturbi emasculates Mozart that is because it is literally true that he robs the music of its force with his trick of beginning a phrase boldly and then falling away to a whisper, often in clear opposition to the tendency of the phrase itself, which rises to higher and higher points of intensity. The recorded sound of the orchestra is a little harsh.

On the other hand we are indebted to Victor for a fine performance by Koussevitzky and the Boston Symphony of Mozart's exquisite early Symphony K. 201, which has been available until now only in the strangely stodgy performance by Beecham on Columbia. With K. 201 in the same Victor set (795, $5) is the superb Symphony K. 338, which Koussevitzky also does very well, without in this instance equaling Beecham's deeply felt and spaciously drawn performance in the old Columbia set. The recorded sound of this Beecham performance is astonishingly good, but is pitched a half-tone too high at the usual seventy-eight revolutions per minute; the recorded sound of Koussevitzky's performances is excessively sharp.

Harsh also is the sound of Toscanini's superb performances of the Preludes to Acts 1 and 3 of Verdi's "La Traviata" on a Victor single disc (18080, $1).

In addition to these Victor records I have heard Columbia's set (462, $3.50) of Mozart's great Quartet K. 421, in a wonderful performance by the Budapest Quartet, the sound of which is well reproduced on the records but is accompanied by noises. B. H. HAGGIN

CONTRIBUTORS

DONALD W. MITCHELL is a close student of naval and military strategy and a frequent contributor to *The Nation.*

PIERRE COT was Air Minister in several French Cabinets, including that of Léon Blum. He came to the United States after France's capitulation.

ROGER N. BALDWIN, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, was imprisoned as a conscientious objector during the First World War.

RUSTEM VAMBERY, Hungarian criminologist and sociologist, has written extensively on European problems.

GEORGE BARKER is an English poet at present in the United States.

DOUGLAS HASKELL was formerly on the editorial staff of the *Architectural Record.*

BABETTE DEUTSCH, poet and critic, received the Julia Ellsworth Ford Foundation award for "Walt Whitman: Builder for America."

ROSE M. STEIN writes regularly on labor problems for *The Nation.*

HENRY GUERLAC is assistant professor of the history of science at the University of Wisconsin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESORTS

Different—

• is the word for Glenmere

"A Fortnight of unforgettable pleasure" . . . "The most congenial vacation I have ever had" . . . "Enjoyed my stay beyond words" . . . Guest's praise that is the appraisal of a Glenmere vacation . . . You, too can enjoy the advantages found only on this 1,600 Acre private estate:

- Improved Golf Course (Free Golf during week)
- 12 Miles of Bridle Paths
- 7½ Miles of Lake Front
- Fisherman's Paradise (See our Fisherman's Den)
- Country Club Sports and Social Programs

Glenmere

CHESTER, NEW YORK
51 Miles from N.Y.C. Tel.: Chester 200
N. Y. C. Phone REctor 2-5047

LIVE YOUR HOLIDAY at CAMP MILFORD KENT, CONN.

On beautiful Spectacle Lake—2½ hours from N.Y. The ideal spot for a glorious, fun-filled vacation—famous for its gay informality and rustic charm. Every social and athletic activity.

AUGUST RATE $31.50 (No Ups) DAILY $6

Write for Booklet
MICKEY MICHAELS, Dir.
11 W. 42, N. Y.
PEnn. 6-7842

Indescribably Beautiful!

Here's Plum Point! 70 acres of heaven tumbling down to the Hudson . . . with rose gardens and rare trees . . . with every sport . . . with informal entertainment, arts and crafts . . . a huge musical library . . . *Attractive Rates. Booklet on Request.*

Plum Point
the year round vacation resort
New Windsor, N.Y. Newburgh 4270

There is only one
RED OAKS
A Country Estate just 50 miles from New York
at ELBERON, NEW JERSEY
Under the Management of
MASCHA & HYMAN STRUNSKY
ALL SPORTS OPEN ALL YEAR
Tel.: Long Branch 3330

TIMBERLAND
POTTERSVILLE · NEW YORK
The Rare Charm of an Intimate, Congenial Group
Limited to 100
5 Clay Tennis Courts — All Social & Sports Activities
ATTRACTIVE RATES—OPEN ALL SEPTEMBER
N. Y. O. Office: 35 W. 42nd St. LO 5-3674

CAMP HYGIOLOGY
at Verplanck Point, New York
VEGETARIAN RESORT for adults and children, on Hudson. 35 miles. Beautiful private lake. 60-acre estate. All sports. Rustic beauty and simplicity. Excellent foods. Slenderizing and building diets. Scientific tables. Also children's camp with counselor service. Housekeeping bungalows by season. Rates, $18 up. Children, $12 up. Write for Camp bulletin.

★ STAR LAKE CAMP ★
In the Glorious Adirondacks
Between Thousand Islands and Ausable Chasm. A marvelous pleasure playground, 1,800 feet elevation and right on the lake with plenty of gorgeous woodlands. Bungalows and lodges with hot and cold running water and modern conveniences. Tennis Courts, Canoeing, Swimming, Handball, Baseball, Ping Pong, Fishing, Saddle Horses, Golf, Cards, Dancing, etc. Interesting one-day trips arranged. Delicious wholesome meals that pep up the appetite. Dietary laws. Rate $25.00 weekly. New Bungalows, semi-private baths for couples—$27.50 per person.
Send for Booklet — New York Office
116 NASSAU ST., Room 802a, CO 7-2667
Sundays, Evenings, Holidays — PR4-1390
Auto service from and to New York every Saturday and Sunday

Twin Pines on Trout Lake
An ADIRONDACK Adult Camp: Complete — Modern
4 doubles tennis courts; cement handball courts, swimming, boating, etc. Hotel comforts — camp informality.
Write for Booklet
N. Y. C. Tel. TRiangle 5-8550
TWIN PINES
J. Saidel, Manager
P. O., Lake George, N. Y.

BEACON LIGHT HOTEL
Fishkill, N. Y. Beacon 1544
A beautiful estate in which to spend a quiet and entertaining vacation. All outdoor and indoor activities. Private Lake. Good food.
Just 55 miles from Times Sq. off Route 9

FORTY-LOVE
Because South Wind (with a capacity of 125) has built its four clay tennis courts with care, it has attracted a "Tennis Crowd"—a young, eager group of fine adults.
SOUTH WIND
P. O. Box No. 38 WOODBOURNE, N. Y.
LARGE PRIVATE LAKE • ALL SPORTS
New York City Phone: CI 5-8378

ARCADIA OPEN ALL YEAR
FISHKILL, N. Y. Beacon 727
90 minutes by N. Y. Central to Beacon or by car to Fishkill. Hotel accommodations, camp activities, all sports, tennis, handball, cycling, swimming in finest Hollywood Pool. Golf (35c green fee) nearby. Unexcelled food. Symphonic and orchestral recordings, informal entertainment. A few choice accommodations open for August at only $25 per week. Reserve at once.

SWIM, FISH, PLAY

or rest in the salt air and sunshine of romantic Gloucester. Camp Annisquam—where young people keep young. Send for booklet.
A. RESNICK, Dir., Gloucester, Mass.
NEW YORK OFFICE: Tel. COlumbus 5-7399

CAMP THREE ARROWS
SHRUB OAK, NEW YORK
40 Miles from City. All Sports. Home cooking.
$18.50 - $20 per week BArclay 7-7127

Classified Advertisements
62 cents a line (six words)
MINIMUM—3 lines
$6.16 per inch
•
THE NATION
55 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Algonquin 4-3311

GREEN MANSIONS welcomes you to its new theatre, lounge, cocktail bar, sun-decks. Log Cabin Clubhouse, each room with private bath. Private golf course, lake, 13 championship tennis courts, all on premises.
LENA BARISH: SAM GARLEN
Directors
N. Y. C. office: 11 W. 42nd St.
Telephone: BRyant 9-1738
Write for Booklet N
Green Mansions
In the Adirondacks-WARRENSBURG, N. Y.

CAMP UNITY
Wingdale, N. Y.
If You're Looking For
VACATION FUN
GALA THEATRICAL PROGRAMS
SIDNEY BECHET And His New Orleans Feet Warmers
TOPS MUSICAL ENTERTAINMENT
Swimming Ball Games
Boating Archery
Tennis Riding
Rates: $22 weekly—$3.75 per day
CAMP UNITY WINGDALE, N.Y. Wingdale 2461
Office: 1 Union Sq., N.Y.C. GR 7-1960

HATHAWAY LODGE
Formerly the palatial 592-acre Macy Estate in the beautiful Hills of the Sky. Large, luxurious rooms, most of which have fireplaces and private porches. Tennis, Handball, Swimming Pool, Horseback Riding; also Golf nearby. Excellent American-Jewish food. A vacation you'll never forget. Reasonable Rates. For reservations or information write—
HATHAWAY LODGE, Haines Falls, N. Y.
Or phone MUrray Hill 2-2492

Tindorest Park
Formerly a millionaire's estate. 150 acres of unusual beauty. Exclusive location. Up-to-the-minute accommodations. All sports facilities. 45 miles from city.
Make Early Reservations
MONROE, N. Y. Phone 7755

The Fieldstone
On Round Island Lake
A place of unexcelled beauty for rest and relaxation. One hour from New York.
ALL SPORTS — OPEN ALL YEAR
MONROE, N. Y. Phone 7965

WESTERN VIEW FARM
Send for Folder
TED OHMER—NEW MILFORD, CONN.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

The McCrary's Position

Dear Sirs: In *The Nation* for July 5 this paragraph appeared in In the Wind:

> Tex McCrary, editor of the New York *Daily Mirror,* may soon break with his boss, William Randolph Hearst. McCrary has been won over to the interventionist position, and his editorials frequently stray from the Hearst line.

I am not the editor of the *Mirror.* I am the chief editorial writer. I write all the editorials—but always subject to the revision of the publisher, C. B. McCabe, and the editor, Jack Lait.

I am not aware that any editorial I have written has "strayed from the Hearst line." I have written much under my own by-line that might be called "interventionist," and on the radio I have set forth reasons why America should declare war on Germany tomorrow. But so far as I know, what I have written under my by-line or said over the radio has not brought me near a "break with my boss."

And may I suggest that in permitting me to express my own views through his largest newspaper and over his most profitable radio station, Mr. Hearst practices that "freedom of speech" which a great many of our alleged liberals only preach. By contrast I do not believe that an isolationist would be permitted to work and write on a newspaper like the *Times* or the *Post.*

And just for the record, I might add that I have not been "won over to the interventionist position" in the sense that you seek to imply. I don't want to declare war on Germany to help England; though I learned to like and respect the English people as individuals on my first trip to that island this winter, I feel that England is getting now precisely what British "misstatesmen" have earned.

I am an "America Firster" in my motives for urging an immediate declaration of war. I believe that war between America and Hitlerism is inevitable—because a victorious Hitler cannot permit America to survive as a last refuge of freedom, to which his people will forever strive to escape. Since war is inevitable, I believe that we should fight now—unprepared as we are—while we still have Britain as a base for attack.

When we have won the war I will become a rampant imperialist—in that I would want to see America *enforce* the peace. Disarm every other nation, including England. Build up and maintain in America a mighty air force, supported by enforced levies on other nations, precisely as a police force is maintained in a community by taxation. No arms of any kind would be permitted in any other nation. The British navy would be scrapped, as would the Luftwaffe and the Japanese navy.

It would be a "Roman peace," and we would be the Romans.

Does that sound nuts? I am eager to listen to an alternative suggestion.

REAGAN MC CRARY

New York, July 24

[We agree with Mr. McCrary that after the war there ought to be a world police force to guard the peace. But the control of such a force cannot be left in the hands of any one nation, not even those of the United States. For that would mean domination of the world by this country, and the fact that our overlordship operated under the banners of democracy and peace would not make it tolerable to other nations. It would be far safer and simpler for us to accept a full share of responsibility, with other free peoples, for the successful functioning of some form of international government equipped with sufficient powers to maintain universal law and order.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

A Great German

Dear Sirs: There must still be many Americans who remember from better days the Leipzig philosopher and scientist Hans Driesch, sometime lecturer in several of our universities and Carl Schurz Memorial Professor at Wisconsin in 1926, author (in English) of "The Science and Philosophy of the Organism" (originally Gifford lectures at Aberdeen), a world traveler and teacher, a wise man who talked jest and earnest in many tongues and loved humanity whether in the robes of a Chinese mandarin or in a college sweater. He was known on our campus as "Old Soc" among the students and in the science laboratories as the "fallen angel of the biologists" (for his metaphysical heresies). He was loved by everybody in our little Wisconsin city and, surely, in all earth's cities, wherever he lingered on his long odyssey of the spirit.

There will be time and place enough to appraise his personality and his contribution to thought. This note is simply to tell you that he died on April 16, 1941, at Leipzig, in his seventy-fourth year. After 1933 he was deprived of all right to lecture in or out of university halls throughout the Third Reich, and was not permitted to leave the country. He was a great German, and in these days, beyond all days in history, we must not forget the great Germans.

M. C. OTTO

WILLIAM ELLERY LEONARD

Madison, Wis., July 28

A "Verbalistic Bat"?

Dear Sirs: Mr. Auden, who has done much to "take the poetry out of poetry," must have been playing solitaire with words when he reviewed "Love in the Western World" in *The Nation* of June 28.

He accepts the postulates that romantic love had its origin in Manicheism, reached its apex in Wagner's "Tristan," and created its own negative in "Don Giovanni." But since Mancheism sought the suppression of everything earthly and absolute absorption into the supreme essence, it seems a queer root for Paola and Francesca and Lancelot and Guinevere, who are certainly descendants of the romantic lovers in the "Romance of the Rose," to which Mr. Auden later refers.

Wagner was obsessed with the idea of *Entsagung* and at the same time determined to write the most passionate love music the world had ever heard. This conflict reached its climax in "Parsifal," which was a combination of bastard Christianity and mongrel Buddhism with, as Huneker remarked, a capon hero to strut the stage. Is Mr. Auden's dissertation on Agape any sounder? Was not the whole review, to quote Huneker again, just a "verbalistic bat"?

O. R. HOWARD THOMPSON

Williamsport, Pa., July 20

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS
THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, $1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED